Calendar No. 163

104TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
104–126

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

AUGUST 4 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1995.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2002]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

Amounts of new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal year 1996

Amount of bill passed by the House	$12,810,725,806
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	12,613,811,567
Amount of budget estimates, 1996	35,468,964,831
Fiscal year 1995 enacted	14,214,401,000

CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

U.S. COAST GUARD

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

TOTAL OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY PROVIDED—GENERAL FUNDS AND TRUST FUNDS

In addition to the appropriation of $12,613,811,567 in new budget authority for fiscal year 1996, large amounts of contract authority are provided by law, the obligation limits for which are contained in the annual appropriations bill. The principal items in this category are the trust funded programs for Federal-aid highways, for mass transit, and for airport development grants. For fiscal year 1996, estimated obligation limitations total $21,320,363,536.

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

During fiscal year 1996, for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), as amended, with respect to appropriations contained in the accompanying bill, the terms ''program, project, and activity'' shall mean any item for which a dollar amount is contained in appropriations acts (including joint resolutions providing continuing appropriations) or accompanying reports of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, or accompanying conference reports and joint explanatory statements of the committee of conference. This definition shall apply to all programs for which new budget (obligational) authority is provided, as well as to discretionary grants and discretionary grant allocations made through either bill or report language. In addition, the percentage reductions made pursuant to a sequestration order to funds appropriated for facilities and equipment, Federal Aviation Administration, and for acquisition, construction, and improvements, Coast Guard, shall be applied equally to each budget item that is listed under said accounts in the budget justifications submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations as modified by subsequent appropriations acts and accompanying committee reports, conference reports, or joint explanatory statements of the committee of conference.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995 [1]	$57,625,000
Budget estimate, 1996	57,459,000
House allowance	55,011,500
Committee recommendation	56,500,000

[1] Excludes amounts transferred for civil rights activities.

Section 3 of the Department of Transportation Act of October 15, 1966 (Public Law 89–670) provides for establishment of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation [OST]. The Office of the Secretary is composed of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary immediate offices, the Office of the General Counsel, and five assistant secretarial offices for transportation policy, aviation and international affairs, budget and programs, governmental affairs, and administration. These secretarial offices have policy development and central supervisory and coordinating functions related to the overall planning and direction of the Department of Transportation, including staff assistance and general management supervision of the counterpart offices in the operating administrations of the Department.

The Minority Business Resource Center, previously funded in this account, is proposed to be funded under a separate account in 1996.

The Committee recommends a total of $56,500,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation including $60,000 for reception and representation expenses.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Appropriations, 1995	([1])
Budget estimate, 1996	$12,793,000
House allowance	6,554,000
Committee recommendation	12,083,000

[1] Transfer authority for $5,376,000 included under salaries and expenses.

The Office of Civil Rights is responsible for advising the Secretary on civil rights and equal employment opportunity matters, formulating civil rights policies and procedures for the operating administrations, investigating claims that small businesses were denied certification or improperly certified as disadvantaged business enterprises, and overseeing the Department's conduct of its civil rights responsibilities and making final determinations on civil rights complaints. In addition, the Civil Rights Office is responsible for enforcing laws and regulations which prohibit discrimination in federally operated and federally assisted transportation programs. In fiscal year 1995, the management of internal

civil rights activities was consolidated in OST with transfer authority provided in the ''Salaries and expenses'' account. In fiscal year 1996, a separate appropriation is requested which will fund all civil rights activities in the Department including handling of external matters, thereby completing the effort initiated in 1995.

The Committee concurs with the administration's proposal and has provided a total of $12,083,000 for the Office of Civil Rights.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1995	$8,293,000
Budget estimate, 1996	15,710,000
House allowance	3,309,000
Committee recommendation	9,710,000

The Office of the Secretary performs those research activities and studies which can more effectively or appropriately be conducted at the departmental level. This research effort supports the planning, research and development activities, and systems development needed to assist the Secretary in the formulation of national transportation policies. The program is carried out primarily through contracts with other Federal agencies, educational institutions, nonprofit research organizations, and private firms. The Committee has fully funded the integrated personnel/payroll system at $3,900,000 and the document management system at $1,000,000, but has deferred funding the new automated procurement system, −$6,000,000.

OFFICE OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

Appropriations, 1995	$6,060,000
Budget estimate, 1996	6,541,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

The Office of Commercial Space Transportation provides regulatory, research and development, and studies needed to carry out the Secretary's responsibilities as defined in Executive Order 12465 to encourage, facilitate, and promote commercial space launches by the United States private sector and to license and regulate commercial launches, launch site operations, and certain payloads under the Commercial Launch Act (Public Law 98–575).

The Department's reorganization plans would shift this activity to the FAA. The Committee has included funding for this office within the Federal Aviation Administration's ''Operations'' account.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Limitation, 1995	($93,000,000)
Limitation estimate, 1996	(104,364,000)
House allowance	(102,231,000)
Committee recommendation	(104,364,000)

The working capital fund [WCF] provides for centralized financing of certain common administrative services (for example, publishing and graphics and computer services) in the interest of economy and efficiency. The fund is reimbursed from the appropriations

of the operating agencies of the Department at rates that recover all operating expenses in full.

A budget amendment proposes to eliminate all appropriations language, consistent with other working capital fund accounts in the Government. As part of its reorganization proposals, the Department plans to create a service bureau financed by the working capital fund to perform common services. The administration also proposed the elimination of any appropriation limitations on the WCF to facilitate the responsive operation of the service bureau.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	($33,423,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	(15,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(26,738,536)

The Secretary of Transportation administers the section 419 Subsidy Program, which was created as part of the Airline Deregulation Act of 1978. Subsidy under this program is paid to airlines, primarily commuter carriers, to support the provision of essential air service to points that would not be served but for the subsidy. The budget proposed elimination of this program in 1996.

Many points are located in remote rural areas: 81 of 100 communities served by the Essential Air Service Program are more than 100 highway miles and 47 are more than 200 miles from the nearest hub airport as defined by section 419. Thirty more communities are located in Alaska, where, in all but two cases, year-round road access does not exist. Without air service, such communities would be further isolated from the Nation's economic centers. Moreover, businesses are typically interested in locating in areas that have convenient access to scheduled air service. Loss of service would seriously hamper small communities' ability to attract new business or even to retain those they now have, resulting in further strain on local economies and loss of jobs.

The Committee recommends a liquidation of contract authorization of $26,738,536 for fiscal year 1996 payments to air carriers which is the same as the limitation on obligations.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The Committee recommends an obligation limitation of $26,738,536, which is $26,738,536 above the administration's request.

Under the Committee's recommended level, funding would not be available to: (1) points that are located fewer than 75 highway miles from the nearest large-, medium-, or small-hub airport; and (2) points that require a rate of subsidy per passenger in excess of $200, when that point is less than 200 miles from a large or medium hub.

The amount recommended by the Committee would be for the following points:

PROJECTED SUBSIDIZED ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE [EAS] FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

States/communities	Estimated mileage to nearest hub (small, medium, or large)	Average daily enplanements at EAS point (year ending June 30, 1994)	Annual subsidy rate projected for fiscal year 1996	Subsidy per passenger
Arizona:				
Kingman	103	10.7	$162,880	$24.34
Page	274	20.5	201,466	15.66
Prescott	103	41.1	162,880	6.34
Arkansas:				
El Dorado/Camden	108	10.9	850,472	124.89
Harrison	139	10.3	756,491	117.60
California: Crescent City	233	13.0	298,868	36.68
Colorado:				
Cortez	253	27.9	144,273	8.27
Lamar	162	4.1	172,139	67.32
Illinois: Mount Vernon	93	7.9	576,192	116.12
Iowa: Ottumwa	92	6.3	309,704	79.07
Kansas:				
Dodge City	156	13.1	280,874	34.15
Garden City	209	21.9	280,874	20.49
Goodland	190	3.2	172,139	139.67
Great Bend	116	4.8	280,874	92.76
Hays	175	16.7	280,874	26.90
Liberal/Guymon	162	10.1	172,139	27.28
Topeka	76	31.8	47,788	2.40
Maine:				
Bar Harbor	164	17.6	452,889	41.09
Rockland	79	11.2	452,889	64.60
Minnesota:				
Fairmont	153	4.0	191,688	76.28
Fergus Falls	185	10.9	227,340	33.21
Mankato	75	4.5	191,688	68.58
Missouri:				
Cape Girardeau	133	18.8	254,525	21.58
Fort Leonard Wood	130	12.2	293,184	38.52
Kirksville	158	8.4	366,503	69.39
Montana:				
Glasgow	279	5.9	350,719	94.33
Glendive	223	2.9	608,761	339.14
Havre	251	4.4	507,660	185.14
Lewiston	[1] 400	3.6	507,660	224.73
Miles City	[1] 400	3.0	608,760	321.59
Sidney	273	7.7	608,761	125.73
Wolf Point	295	6.3	350,719	88.97
Nebraska:				
Alliance	242	2.3	223,029	151.93
Chadron	301	2.3	223,029	152.66
Hastings	160	3.0	178,810	93.86
Kearney	186	11.2	507,672	72.38
McCook	259	3.4	328,862	155.86
North Platte	282	5.2	144,292	44.05
Scottsbluff	202	8.6	144,292	26.92
Nevada: Ely	236	5.7	727,082	203.61
New Mexico:				
Alamogordo/Holloman AFB	92	11.6	277,360	38.30
Clovis	106	14.6	310,860	34.01
Silver City/Hurley/Deming	163	10.4	408,814	62.62

PROJECTED SUBSIDIZED ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE [EAS] FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—Continued

States/communities	Estimated mileage to nearest hub (small, medium, or large)	Average daily enplanements at EAS point (year ending June 30, 1994)	Annual subsidy rate projected for fiscal year 1996	Subsidy per passenger
New York:				
Massena	149	20.1	205,665	16.32
Ogdensburg	127	10.5	205,665	31.27
North Dakota:				
Devils Lake	403	11.8	322,943	42.75
Dickinson	313	7.5	163,295	34.57
Jamestown	304	10.8	322,943	11.94
Oklahoma:				
Enid	91	9.4	446,752	70.71
Ponca City	88	11.8	446,752	56.26
Pennsylvania: Oil City/Franklin	91	30.5	168,592	18.87
Puerto Rico: Ponce	80	31.2	325,247	16.63
South Dakota: Yankton	96	10.1	417,220	67.50
Texas: Brownwood	153	4.7	429,722	162.27
Utah:				
Cedar City	173	18.7	503,354	43.11
Moab	241	6.1	484,552	127.51
Vernal	171	17.0	305,311	28.70
Virginia: Staunton	108	35.0	308,054	14.04
Washington: Ephrata/Moses Lake	122	16.1	326,875	32.42
West Virginia:				
Beckley	186	19.3	250,498	20.74
Clarksburg/Fairmont	107	8.8	259,689	46.92
Morgantown	75	12.0	259,689	34.60
Princeton/Bluefield	145	21.6	250,498	18.56
Wyoming: Worland	164	9.1	167,583	29.38
Subtotal of long-term non-Alaska rates	.....	.....	21,169,673	.....
Other projected subsidy obligations:				
Long-term Alaska rates	.....	.....	1,806,143	.....
Expected subsidy rate adjustments and carrier selections in fiscal year 1996	.....	.....	2,262,720	.....
Estimated fiscal year 1996 hold-in compensation	.....	.....	1,500,000	.....
Total projected fiscal year 1996 obligations	.....	.....	26,738,536	.....

[1] Distance from medium or large hub airport.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(RESCISSION ON CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Rescission, 1995	($4,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996 [1]	(38,600,000)
House allowance	(23,600,000)
Committee recommendation	(11,861,464)

[1] Consistent with the budget proposal to eliminate this program in 1996, contract authority previously enacted is proposed to be rescinded.

The House has included bill language which would rescind $23,600,000 of contract authority funding for the payments to air carriers program, because the fully authorized level of $38,600,000 in contract authority would not be available under the House's proposed $15,000,000 limitation on obligations. Under the Senate proposal only $11,861,464 of the contract authority would be unused.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(RESCISSION)

Rescission, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	−$6,786,971
House allowance	−6,786,971
Committee recommendation	−6,786,971

The amount proposed for rescission represents balances from prior years. The Airline Deregulation Act of 1978, section 419, included a subsidy program to ensure scheduled air service to specified communities. Prior to fiscal year 1992, funding for this subsidy was provided from the "General fund" account. Starting in fiscal year 1992, this program has been funded from the "Payments to air carriers trust fund" account. For the past several years, balances have been carried forward in the "General fund" account. These balances are no longer required as the program is now funded from the trust fund account.

RENTAL PAYMENTS

Appropriations, 1995	$144,419,000
Budget estimate, 1996[1 2]	143,436,000
House allowance	130,803,000
Committee recommendation	139,689,000

[1] Rental payments for the FHWA are separately budgeted but reimbursed to this account.
[2] Includes budget amendment to reduce this account by $2,000,000 to offset an increase for aviation security.

Rental payments to the General Services Administration [GSA] are included as a separate line-item appropriation in the bill.

The Committee has provided an appropriation of $139,689,000 for rental payments in fiscal year 1996, plus $18,750,000 to be paid by reimbursement from the highway trust fund. This is a 2.5-percent decrease from the 1995 enacted level.

GSA RENTAL PAYMENTS [1]

[Dollars and square feet in thousands]

Administration	Fiscal year 1994 enacted		Fiscal year 1994 GSA billings	Fiscal year 1995 enacted		Fiscal year 1996 request	
	Funding	Square feet		Funding	Square feet	Funding	Square feet
Federal Highway Administration	[$17,524]	[987]	[$16,503]	[$18,044]	[987]	[$18,750]	[991]
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	4,511	154	4,407	4,716	155	4,483	155
Federal Railroad Administration	3,524	141	3,082	3,363	135	3,318	138
Federal Transit Administration	3,295	108	3,184	3,332	109	3,317	108
Federal Aviation Administration	74,858	4,063	71,024	75,820	4,374	74,710	4,082
U.S. Coast Guard	44,746	2,430	40,602	42,281	2,347	41,028	2,308
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	175	6	170	181	6	169	6
Research and Special Programs Administration	2,303	76	2,258	2,378	77	2,459	80
Office of the Inspector General	2,604	95	2,309	2,579	94	2,542	94
Office of Secretary of Transportation	13,475	1,442	13,257	9,679	1,440	11,306	1,441
Bureau of Transportation Statistics	114	3	114	90	3	104	7
OST—rental payments to GSA	[149,605]	.....	[140,407]	[144,419]	.....	[143,436]	.....
Subtotal	149,605	8,518	140,407	144,419	8,740	143,436	8,419
Rescissions	[1,781]	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Federal Highway Administration	17,524	945	16,476	18,044	987	18,750	991
Total, Department of Transportation (excludes MarAd)	165,348	9,463	156,883	162,463	9,727	162,186	9,410

[1] Enacted as a single account under the Office of the Secretary of Transportation. The budgets propose appropriations language which directs the reimbursement of FHWA GSA rent from FHWA LGOE account to the consolidated account.

HEADQUARTERS FACILITIES

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	$331,000,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

The administration has requested funding for the acquisition or construction of a Department of Transportation headquarters building. Leases for two headquarters buildings will expire within the next 8 years—Nassif building in 2000 and Transpoint in 2003. Since purchase of headquarters space will be more cost effective than leasing, this strategy includes the acquisition of 1.1 million square feet of space near the current location. Funding is requested in 1996 to provide for orderly planning and acquisition of the space. Funds are budgeted in DOT as a result of a change in administrative policy to budget for space acquisition in the affected agency rather than through GSA.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1995	$1,900,000
Budget estimate, 1996	1,900,000
House allowance	1,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,900,000

Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization [OSDBU]/Minority Business Resource Center [MBRC].—The OSDBU/MBRC provides assistance in obtaining short-term working capital and bonding for disadvantaged, minority, and women-owned businesses [DBE/MBE/WBE's]. In fiscal year 1996, the short-term loan program will focus on the lending of working capital to DBE/MBE/WBE's for transportation-related projects in order to strengthen their competitive and productive capabilities.

Since fiscal year 1993, the loan program has been a separate line item appropriation, which reflects the President's budget proposal, which segregated such activities in response to changes made by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990. The limitation on direct loans under the Minority Business Resource Center is at the administration's requested level of $15,000,000.

The Department is projecting that the authorized loan level of $15,000,000 will be reached in fiscal years 1995 and 1996. The program provides a valuable source of working capital for minority businesses to manage their transportation-related contracts.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

Appropriations, 1995	([1])
Budget estimate, 1996	$2,900,000
House allowance	2,900,000
Committee recommendation	2,100,000

[1] Previously funded under OST, salaries and expenses.

This appropriation provides contractual support to assist minority business firms, entrepreneurs, and venture groups in securing contracts and subcontracts arising out of projects that involve Federal spending. It also provides support to historically black and Hispanic colleges. Separate funding is requested by the administra-

tion since this program provides grants and contract assistance that serves DOT-wide goals and not just OST purposes.

ICC SUNSET

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	$4,705,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	4,705,000

A separate salaries and expenses request was included in the budget for $4,705,000 representing functions that would transfer to DOT upon sunset of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The administration proposed legislation to sunset the Interstate Commerce Commission with residual rail and motor carrier functions transferring to the DOT. Handling of consumer complaints regarding household goods movers and review of rail mergers and acquisitions were proposed to be transferred to the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, respectively.

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996[1]	$2,000,000,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	250,000,000

[1] The administration included funding to capitalize State infrastructure banks in the "Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program" account.

The Committee has included a general provision, section 349, to establish infrastructure banks. The bill language allows States to deposit funds into the bank from non-Federal or Federal sources, including apportioned highway funds, for initial capital of the bank. In addition, the Committee has appropriated $250,000,000 from the airport and airway trust fund to cover expected aviation-related infrastructure improvements.

The Committee considers the Alameda transportation corridor in Los Angeles County, CA, as an example of a project that would greatly benefit from the innovative financing option as provided in this bill. The project will streamline rail and highway transportation between the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and intermodal connections in downtown Los Angeles. The rail portion of the project will consolidate the operations of three freight carriers into one higher speed corridor and eliminate conflicts with highway crossings. Highways will also be improved to provide better access from the ports to the freeways. The increased transportation efficiency will provide the added benefit of decreased air pollution.

The Senate recently designated the route as a high-priority corridor on the National Highway System, enabling the Secretary of Transportation to work cooperatively with the project sponsors on using creative financing to advance the project, including eligibility for a line of credit. Shipping revenues from the completed project will enable the sponsors to repay construction financing.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1995 .....
Budget estimate, 1996 ..... $24,392,976,000
House allowance .....
Committee recommendation .....

The budget request submitted by the administration proposed that certain programs for the Department of Transportation be funded from the Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP]. This new account is structured in two parts: Federal activities and State and local activities, reflecting the administration's initiative to shift programs to State and local decisionmaking.

While infrastructure spending is $2,300,000,000 below comparable fiscal year 1995 funding, new and more flexible funding mechanisms are proposed which should allow States and localities to stretch and leverage reduced Federal dollars. The new programs proposed include an $18,000,000,000 unified allocation grant that will be available to States and localities to spend on their transportation priorities. UTIIP also includes a $1,000,000,000 discretionary grant to focus on projects of national or regional significance and $2,000,000,000 to capitalize State infrastructure banks. Funding for such activities as Amtrak, Northeast corridor, and transit operating assistance which were separately appropriated in previous years are included as line items in UTIIP. Also included is $1,100,000,000 for prior commitments including full funding agreements for transit new start projects, WMATA, and existing airport letters of intent. The following table compares funding levels for fiscal year 1995 and those proposed in 1996 both under UTIIP and current law.

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PROGRAM—APPROPRIATIONS AND OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1995 comparable	1996 President's budget	
		Current law [1]	UTIIP policy
State and local initiatives			
Unified grant	[2] 22,911,258	[2] 23,941,663	18,000,000
State infrastructure banks	.....	.....	2,000,000
Transit operating assistance	710,000	500,000	500,000
Prior commitment (LOI's, new starts, WMATA)	1,009,018	1,142,972	1,142,972
Rhode Island rail development	5,000	10,000	10,000
Total, State and local initiatives	24,635,276	25,594,635	21,652,972
Direct Federal Programs			
Discretionary grants (new program)	.....	[3] 300,000	1,000,000
Federal lands	448,000	[4] 348,432	441,775
Research and development [5]	239,079	217,237	219,027
Grants to Amtrak	772,000	750,000	750,000
Northeast corridor improvement project	200,000	235,000	235,000
Pennsylvania Station redevelopment	40,000	50,000	50,000
Administrative expenses [6]	43,060	44,202	44,202

UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PROGRAM—APPROPRIATIONS AND OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1995 comparable	1996 President's budget	
		Current law [1]	UTIIP policy
Total, direct Federal	1,742,139	1,944,871	2,740,004
Total, UTIIP	26,377,415	27,539,506	24,392,976

[1] Reflects the impact of reductions pursuant to ISTEA section 1003(c), for example, Federal lands.
[2] Includes portions of Federal-aid highways, grants-in-aid for airports (except for existing LOI's), transit formula capital and discretionary grants (except for FFGA's), and local rail freight assistance (fiscal year 1995 only).
[3] Congestion relief initiative.
[4] Estimated obligations.
[5] Includes in each year intelligent transportation systems, university transportation centers, and transit planning and research.
[6] Includes transit only; FHWA limitation on general operating expenses included as drawdown under unified grant.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Advisory committee cap.—The Committee has included bill language which would limit the total amount to be spent for advisory committees to $850,000. Twenty-eight committees currently exist to provide advisory services to nine different modal and administrative agencies of the Department of Transportation. The amount recommended is the same as the fiscal year 1995 level. The House has not included bill language which caps advisory committee expenses.

The Committee believes that the Department's use of advisory committees, when carried out judiciously, is a cost-effective means of obtaining advice and information. Advisory committees generally have the advantages of timeliness and objectivity over the alternatives of internal task forces and external contracting. These advantages are especially germane when the issues being studied are subjective and controversial and require conclusions to be drawn on the basis of qualitative data. The Committee strongly encourages DOT to continue to draw heavily on the expertise, guidance, and breadth of the intelligent transportation systems community perspective of the Intelligent Transportation Society of America and the avionics expertise of the RTCA.

Department appointees.—The Committee has included bill language, which is similar to that included in previous years, which limits the total number of political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation. The Department's appointee cap is set at 100.

Cooperative agreements.—The Committee continued a general provision, included in the fiscal year 1995 appropriations bill, which will grant the Secretary of Transportation specific statutory authority to enter into grants, cooperative agreements, and other transactions with any entity in execution of the technology reinvestment project [TRP] authorized under the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment, and Transition Assistance Act of 1992 and related legislation.

Telecommuting public information program.—The Committee has included a general provision which directs the Department of Transportation to identify successful telecommuting programs used

by Government agencies and private companies and to publicize information about such programs in order to broaden public awareness of the benefits of telecommuting. The Secretary would also be required to report to Congress on his findings, conclusions, and recommendations with respect to telecommuting within 1 year of enactment. It is in the national interest to encourage telecommuting because it can enable flexible family-friendly employment, reduce air pollution, and conserve energy.

Bonus and award payments.—The Department of Transportation has budgeted $26,627,927 for performance awards for all employee levels. All of the bonus and award payments are discretionary. The Committee has included language limiting the allowable Department bonuses and awards to the amounts depicted below.

In each of the accounts that contain personnel funds, the reduction associated with the bonuses and awards is depicted as an accountwide adjustment. The total amount recommended for each agency versus the 1996 budget request is depicted below. The Committee has included a general provision in the bill which limits funds for employee bonuses and awards to $25,875,075.

PERFORMANCE AWARDS

Agency	Fiscal year 1995 limitation	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Office of the Secretary	$662,036	$681,000	$662,036
Coast Guard	1,728,626	1,720,000	1,720,000
Federal Aviation Administration	20,957,888	21,678,000	20,957,888
Federal Highway Administration	1,342,432	1,303,500	1,303,500
Bureau of Transportation Statistics	13,981	22,427	18,000
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	304,897	305,000	304,897
Federal Railroad Administration	307,900	314,000	307,900
Federal Transit Administration	220,857	221,000	220,857
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	49,217	49,000	49,000
Research and Special Programs Administration[1]	148,170	148,000	145,000
Office of Inspector General	185,996	186,000	185,996
Total	25,922,000	26,627,927	25,875,075

[1] Excludes Volpe National Transportation Systems Center.

DOT REORGANIZATION

Both the administration and Congress have been engaged in a fundamental reassessment of the means by which the Federal Government fulfills its responsibilities to the American people. The President initiated the ''National Performance Review'' [NPR] soon after taking office, and it has already produced substantial downsizing and performance gains at DOT. Efforts to reduce annual deficits have also put increasing pressure on the Department to find ways to do more with less.

It has become clear that the most fundamental barrier to implementing broad-based, flexible, and well balanced transportation policy and programs is the outmoded division of authority among the different modes of transportation. DOT was originally created as a holding company for existing agencies, including the Federal Highway Administration, the Coast Guard, and the Federal Aviation Administration. Over time, new organizations have been cre-

ated or grafted onto this structure, so DOT now includes nine separate agencies, plus the Bureau of Transportation Statistics. This brings with it tremendous redundancy, particularly in administrative and headquarters activities targeted by the NPR for substantial streamlining. Further, it means a high degree of complexity and potential confusion for DOT customers—in industry, State and local government, and the public at large—who now must go to many separate offices for different services and programs. Organization change is also essential as ambitious goals are implemented for downsizing of the Department.

The DOT proposal for consolidation, which was submitted to Congress on April 4, 1995, involves three major areas. First, all surface and maritime activities, other than Coast Guard and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation [SLSDC], would be combined in a single Intermodal Transportation Administration [ITA]. Second, the Federal Aviation Administration would continue its safety and security functions, incorporating also commercial space activities now housed with the Office of the Secretary. Third, is the Coast Guard—a military service that transfers to the Navy upon declaration of war or when the President directs, and which has a distinct set of functions. No change in the Coast Guard's current status or activities is proposed, except for transfer of bridge-related functions to the ITA. The SLSDC is already a wholly owned Government corporation and would be made a free-standing entity, eliminating an additional management layer. The following table lists those accounts affected by the reorganization.

Accounts proposed to be merged into the Intermodal Transportation Administration:

Unified transportation infrastructure investment program; Federal-aid highways; Right-of-way revolving fund liquidating account; Highway-related safety grants; Motor carrier safety grants; Motor carrier safety; Operations and research [NHTSA]; Operations and research, trust fund [NHTSA]; Highway traffic safety grants; Office of the Administrator [FRA]; Railroad safety; Railroad research and development; Next generation high-speed rail; Railroad rehabilitation and improvement program account; Trust fund share of next generation high-speed rail; Violent crime reduction programs; Alteration of bridges; Operating-differential subsidies; Maritime security program; Operations and training (Maritime Administration); Maritime guaranteed loan (title XI) program account; Research and special programs; Pipeline safety; and Emergency preparedness grants.

Accounts proposed to be included in the Federal Aviation Administration:

Operations; Aviation insurance revolving fund; Aircraft purchase loan guarantee program; Facilities and equipment; and Research, engineering, and development.

Accounts proposed to be included in the Coast Guard:

Operating expenses; Acquisition, construction, and improvements; Environmental compliance and restoration; Retired pay; Reserve training; and Research, development, test, and evaluation.

Account proposed to be established as an independent agency:

St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Operations and maintenance.

IMPACTS OF BUDGET CUTS ON TRANSPORTATION

Under the budget resolution, Federal transportation spending will decrease significantly, from an outlay level of $39,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1995 to $32,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, a cut of approximately 20 percent in nominal dollars. Such a dramatic reduction clearly calls for a fundamental review of transportation programs, and the roles of Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector in meeting transportation needs.

Absent changes in the current structure of transportation programs, the cuts in the budget resolution will be devastating. Existing programs were not designed to absorb such cuts and the projected spending levels will not support current programs and services. Both the Senate Budget Committee in its report, and the House-Senate conference in its report, noted this and called for major changes in the Department of Transportation and its programs, including but not limited to program downsizing, streamlining and consolidation, and air traffic control privatization.

The top priority of our economic agenda is deficit reduction, and transportation must play a role in that effort. However, if this is carried out as nothing more than a budget-cutting exercise, without changes in the way Government provides services, the results on the Nation's mobility and economy could be devastating. These reductions not only provide an opportunity for revamping transportation programs, but also demand it, to ensure that at the same time that we carry through on our commitment to reduce the deficit, we also maintain our commitment to a safe and efficient national transportation system.

Reform of transportation programs should be made in the context of overall governmental reform efforts underway in the administration and the Congress. Principles such as downsizing, streamlining, and the introduction of market forces can and should be a part of any DOT reorganization. Such actions can eliminate redundancies, such as the existence of 10 separate personnel and budget offices throughout the Department. This step would not only make the Department more efficient in its use of taxpayer funds, but also maximize the investment in infrastructure and services, rather than in a Federal bureaucracy.

Investment in transportation infrastructure.—Recent reports indicate that America's infrastructure deficit, the incremental cost above and beyond existing expenditures of bringing our highways and bridges into good repair, is more than $300,000,000,000. At the same time, transportation demand is growing. The impacts of this situation are startling. Over 70 percent of peak hour travel on urban interstates now occurs under congested conditions. The Nation's passenger rail system is starved for capital improvement. With American businesses increasingly relying on an efficient, well-maintained intermodal transportation network to serve just-in-time delivery systems, disinvestment in transportation infrastructure

could have devastating impacts on our mobility and on our economic well-being.

Under these circumstances, a variety of strategies are necessary to stretch the Federal dollar and attract investment from new sources, including the private sector. DOT has successfully launched an innovative finance initiative designed to increase private investment in transportation. As Federal funding becomes more restricted, however, efforts must focus on eliminating redtape, and focusing investments in as efficient a way as possible. The administration has proposed greater flexibility in transportation funding and project selection, with a greater reliance on the planning process created under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991. Particularly given the budgetary constraints facing transportation, this approach merits serious consideration.

Air traffic control.—An area of particular concern is the operation of the air traffic control system. This concern is widespread, as evidenced by such proposals as the administration's plan for a Government-owned corporation to take over the system, to the budget resolution's call for a privatized system, to various proposals to make the FAA an independent agency.

The Committee has been frustrated with the inability of the FAA, working under the traditional governmental structure and rules, to keep its modernization program on track and with the pattern of cost overruns and inefficiencies, that have plagued the FAA. Even with the significant and positive changes recently made, the prospects for a system that can keep pace with the demands of a growing aviation industry are dim unless fundamental changes are made in the structure and financing of the air traffic control system.

The provision of air traffic control [ATC] services is a unique function in government. Unlike traditional regulatory or grant-making functions, ATC services are directly and actively linked with the day-to-day operations of an entire industry. As the industry grows, so must the ability to serve it through ATC. Over the last decade, this Committee has worked to provide adequate funding to help match services with demand. However, the budget resolution seriously jeopardizes the Committee's ability to provide support services that keep up with demand. It is projected by the FAA that the demand for ATC services will grow by 18 percent from fiscal year 1995 to fiscal year 2002. However, under the budget resolution, the resources available to the FAA, in the form of outlays, would shrink by approximately 19 percent in that same timeframe. Under this scenario, the level of service that exists today simply cannot be supported.

COMMITTEE RESPONSE TO BUDGET RESOLUTION

The majority of the changes necessary to address the out-year budget problems comes under the jurisdiction of other committees. To date, no significant transportation reform legislation has been considered in the Senate. However, because of the need to begin dealing with the budgetary realities, and in an attempt to minimize adverse impacts on the Department's programs and services, the Committee has taken several key steps to provide new flexibility and to begin introducing the necessary elements of governmental

reform. These measures are described below. The Committee looks forward to the consideration of more comprehensive reforms to the Department and its programs and services by the authorizing committees, and will take those changes into account when preparing future appropriations for the Department.

State and regional infrastructure banks.—The Committee has included a general provision, section 349, to establish a new funding mechanism for States' infrastructure. Eligibility for State infrastructure banks [SIB] would be the same as under the administration's proposed unified allocation. This provides for a surface transportation program which includes all currently eligible ISTEA activities as well as additional surface transportation activities such as freight rail and port access. It also includes all currently eligible aviation activities and certain new air eligibility such as off-airport access roads. The Committee believes that large intermodal projects and projects with their own revenue streams make the best candidates. Under the Committee's proposal, SIB's will be initially capitalized at $250,000,000 from the airport trust fund and funds deposited in the bank by States using apportioned highway funds.

Funds would be apportioned among the States, in order to provide State and local governments with enhanced ability to tap private markets for infrastructure projects; to enter into shared-financing partnerships with private transportation entities; and to create new intergovernmental financing partnerships among State and sub-State entities. SIB's would have limited ongoing Federal financial oversight and would have no federally imposed sub-State or population set-aside nor any functional set-asides. State participation in SIB's would be voluntary.

In addition to project loans, SIB's could also finance various forms of credit enhancement, acquisition or lease of rolling stock for the purpose of lease pooling, back-stop financing for construction loans, pooling of debt issuances, and refinancing of outstanding debt. SIB's could also receive grants of leveraged funds or fund transferred to the SIB from a State's other Federal infrastructure program funds.

According to AASHTO, about 17 States have current legislation or proposed legislation which is directed toward establishing SIB's or SIB-type institutions. The Committee believes that all 50 States could participate in the SIB's in one form or another.

FAA personnel and procurement reform.—Sections 350 and 351 of the Committee bill provide that funds provided for FAA operations and capital improvements are exempt from various Federal personnel and procurement requirements. This will result in the more efficient modernization of the ATC system, and in a more efficient and cost-effective deployment of the air traffic control work force. This does not, however, do away with the need for fundamental reform of the budget process with regard to air traffic control. It is intended only as an interim step toward a reformed air traffic control structure.

Aviation user fee structure.—The Committee directs the Department to prepare a new aviation user fee structure for air traffic control and other services that would more closely align payments with costs imposed, and to submit a report on such a new structure

not later than December 1, 1995. This would assist in preparing a more accurate determination of system needs, and in the consideration of an alternative budget treatment for air traffic control and other aviation funding.

Report on impacts of budget cuts.—The Committee directs the Department to submit to the Committee, not later than November 1, 1995, a report on the impacts on transportation of the budget resolution if no significant changes in transportation authorizations occur. This report shall include discussion of services that would be discontinued, programs that would be eliminated, and the reductions in investment programs that would result from lower levels of spending without the benefit of changes such as those assumed in the budget resolution.

Advanced notice of proposed rulemaking [ANPRM].—The FAA is directed to initiate, in not more than 90 days, an ANPRM on the range of regulatory and operational changes, and their impacts, necessitated by funding limitations that would result from a lack of change in the FAA's structure and funding. Issues addressed in the ANPRM should include: closure of level I or II air traffic towers; closure of flight service stations; delays in the issuance of aircraft, airmen, and other certificates; the effect on delays in the aviation system and any measures necessary to address increased delays; impacts on airport capacity and safety if Federal assistance is terminated; reductions in the number and frequency of safety and security inspections; and the impact on the FAA's efforts to enhance the international safety of Americans abroad. The Committee expects the FAA to seek widespread participation in this process by the public and the user community, including through public meetings.

Asset sales.—The Coast Guard and FAA, like many other agencies, are reorganizing and downsizing while providing critical services to the public at less cost. Both the Senate and House of Representatives, in their respective versions of the concurrent resolution on the budget for 1996, indicated clear support for seeking a change in the rules that currently do not allow agencies to obtain budgetary credit for the sale of governmental assets.

The Committee believes that the Coast Guard, the FAA, and the Government as a whole, would benefit substantially if allowed budgetary credit for property they expect to excess as part of downsizing efforts. The President's fiscal year 1996 budget also proposed a change in the asset scoring rule to allow the proceeds of sales to be scored as credits in the budget.

The Committee strongly supports the lifting of the prohibition on the scoring of asset sales for budget purposes and the concurrent generation of receipts to reduce the Federal budget deficit. Clearly, there is the potential for a very positive benefit if the Coast Guard and the FAA are permitted to receive credit for the value of excessed property.

Field office and other consolidations.—The Committee has retained section 335 of the general provisions title proposed by the House, which permanently cancels $25,000,000 from budgetary resources provided to the Department of Transportation. These savings are expected from the Secretary reducing the existing field office structure and, to the extent practicable, consolidating the De-

partment's administrative activities. In testimony presented to this Committee by the General Accounting Office, it was stated that the Department may realize significant savings by consolidating many of its existing field offices into larger and less specialized offices. The Committee expects that these savings will not necessarily come through simple consolidation, but that the Department will also seek to consolidate overhead activities such as payroll, public affairs, grants administration, as well as accounting and personnel functions.

U.S. COAST GUARD

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1996 PROGRAM

The U.S. Coast Guard, as it is known today, was established on January 28, 1915, through the merger of the Revenue Cutter Service and the Lifesaving Service. In 1939, the U.S. Lighthouse Service was transferred to the Coast Guard, followed by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation in 1942. The Coast Guard has as its primary responsibilities the enforcement of all applicable Federal laws on the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; promotion of safety of life and property at sea; assistance to navigation; protection of the marine environment; and maintenance of a state of readiness to function as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war (14 U.S.C. 1, 2).

The Committee recommends a total program level of $3,654,822,000 for the activities of the Coast Guard in fiscal year 1996. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1995 enacted [1]	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendations [2]
Operating expenses	[3] 2,635,839	2,618,316	2,565,607	2,586,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements [4]	362,937	428,200	375,175	366,800
Environmental compliance and restoration	23,497	25,000	21,000	21,000
Port safety development	.....	.....	.....	15,000
Alteration of bridges	.....	2,000	16,000	2,000
Retired pay	562,585	582,022	582,022	582,022
Reserve training	64,977	64,859	61,859	62,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation	20,306	22,500	18,500	20,000
Boat safety	25,000	.....	20,000	.....
Total	3,695,141	3,742,897	3,660,163	3,654,822

[1] Includes reductions pursuant to sections 330 and 331 of Public Law 103–331 and amounts transferred to OST, salaries and expenses for civil rights activities.

[2] Includes $300,000,000 provided by the Department of Defense for national defense missions.

[3] Includes $11,200,000 in Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1995 and $28,297,000 in Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1995.

[4] Excludes $6,378,000 reduction of unobligated balances for procurement and procurement-related expenses canceled pursuant to section 323 of Public law 103–331.

OPERATING EXPENSES

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 1995 [1]	$2,585,839,347	$50,000,000	$2,635,839,347
Budget estimate, 1996	2,593,316,000	25,000,000	2,618,316,000
House allowance	2,515,607,000	50,000,000	2,565,607,000
Committee recommendation	2,261,000,000	25,000,000	[2] 2,586,000,000

[1] Includes $11,200,000 by transfer from the Department of Defense and $28,297,000 in Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1995.
[2] Includes $300,000,000 by transfer from the Department of Defense.

The "Operating expenses" appropriation provides funds for the operation and maintenance of multipurpose vessels, aircraft, and shore units strategically located along the coasts and inland waterways of the United States and in selected areas overseas.

The program activities of this appropriation fall into the following categories:

Search and rescue.—One of its earliest and most traditional missions, the Coast Guard maintains a nationwide system of boats, aircraft, cutters, and rescue coordination centers on 24-hour alert.

Aids to navigation.—To help mariners determine their location and avoid accidents, the Coast Guard maintains a network of manned and unmanned aids to navigation along our coasts and on our inland waterways, and operates radio stations in the United States and abroad to serve the needs of the armed services and marine and air commerce.

Marine safety.—The Coast Guard insures compliance with Federal statutes and regulations designed to improve safety in the merchant marine industry and operates a recreational boating safety program.

Marine environmental protection.—The primary objectives of this program are to minimize the dangers of marine pollution and to assure the safety of U.S. ports and waterways.

Enforcement of laws and treaties.—The Coast Guard is the principal maritime enforcement agency with regard to Federal laws on the navigable waters of the United States and the high seas, including fisheries, drug smuggling, illegal immigration, and hijacking of vessels.

Ice operations.—In the Arctic and Antarctic, Coast Guard icebreakers escort supply ships, support research activities and Department of Defense operations, survey uncharted waters, and collect scientific data. The Coast Guard also assists commercial vessels through ice-covered waters.

Defense readiness.—During peacetime the Coast Guard maintains an effective state of military preparedness to operate as a service in the Navy in time of war or national emergency at the direction of the President. As such the Coast Guard has primary responsibility for the security of ports, waterways, and navigable waters up to 200 miles offshore.

Headquarters administration.—The headquarters administration activity provides executive direction and servicewide administrative support at the headquarters location of the Coast Guard.

COMMITTEE FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation for Coast Guard operating expenses is $2,586,000,000, including $25,000,000 from the oilspill liability trust fund and $300,000,000 from DOD for national defense missions.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1995 enacted	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Pay and allowances:				
Military pay and benefits	1,226,672	1,230,154	1,209,853	1,212,254
Civilian pay and benefits	173,367	177,263	177,613	176,438
Permanent change of station	59,967	60,233	60,233	60,233
Medical care and equipment	124,487	124,185	117,885	124,185
Leased housing	.....	.....	14,900	14,900
Activitywide adjustments	.....	.....	9,850	−8,000
Total, pay and allowances	1,584,495	1,591,835	1,570,634	1,580,010
Depot level maintenance:				
Aircraft	148,741	139,041	139,041	139,041
Electronics	36,032	31,549	31,549	31,549
Shore facilities	94,126	95,645	95,645	94,126
Vessels	101,165	99,081	99,081	99,081
Total, depot level maintenance	380,064	365,316	365,316	363,797
Operations and support:				
Area operations and support:				
Cutters:				
Medium endurance (WMEC)	18,219	15,451	15,451	15,451
High endurance (WHEC)	10,807	11,070	11,070	10,807
Polar WAGB's	1,936	2,024	2,024	2,024
Area offices	11,333	12,156	12,156	11,333
Maintenance and logistics commands	122,882	125,616	125,616	122,882
Communication stations	3,107	3,262	3,262	3,107
District operations and support:				
District offices	61,426	56,641	51,041	56,641
Groups/bases	68,015	68,592	68,592	68,015
Combined group/air station	9,468	9,827	9,827	9,468
Air stations	46,927	45,028	45,028	45,028
Marine safety offices	7,645	9,785	9,785	8,500
Long-range electronic navaids (Loran)	6,254	6,491	6,491	6,254
Cutters-WLB's and smaller; *Mackinaw*	27,984	29,599	29,599	29,599
Vessel traffic service [VTS] systems	219	247	247	247
Ammunition and small arms	5,791	4,707	4,707	4,707
Total, operations and support	393,083	400,496	394,896	394,063
Recruiting and training support:				
Recruiting	5,861	5,467	5,467	5,467
Training centers (Yorktown and Petaluma)	27,535	26,522	26,522	26,522
Coast Guard Academy	12,635	12,747	12,747	12,747
Professional training and education	25,833	26,207	25,207	26,207

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1995 enacted	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Total, recruiting and training support	71,864	70,943	69,943	70,943
Coast Guard-wide centralized services and support:				
Headquarters-managed units:				
Supply centers	8,914	8,554	8,554	8,554
Finance center	4,682	4,776	4,776	4,776
Military pay and personnel center	1,115	1,137	1,137	1,137
Activities Europe	5,552	−1,372	−1,372	−1,372
Coast Guard yard	1,913	1,945	1,945	1,945
Strike teams	2,531	2,678	2,678	2,678
National Pollution Funds Center	1,207	1,231	1,231	1,231
COMDAC support facility	2,024	2,054	2,054	2,054
Air station Washington, DC	907	925	925	925
Operations Systems Center	5,123	6,901	6,901	6,901
Telecommunications/information systems command	2,801	2,919	2,919	2,900
Navigation Systems Center	3,866	404	404	404
Intelligence Coordination Center	258	263	263	263
Electronics Engineering Center	2,828	3,533	3,533	3,533
Coast Guard Institute	744	759	759	759
Research and Development Center	429	436	436	436
Military Personnel Center	786	801	651	801
Headquarters	120,918	120,125	119,497	119,800
Centralized bill paying:				
Postal	7,516	6,674	6,674	6,674
FTS	12,500	12,060	10,626	11,500
Federal employment compensation	6,243	6,890	6,243	6,890
Unemployment compensation	4,546	4,661	4,546	4,546
Total, Coast Guard-wide centralized services and support	197,403	189,726	185,380	187,335
Total, accountwide adjustments	.....	.....	18,562	10,148
Total appropriation	2,607,542	2,618,316	2,565,607	2,586,000

Note: Fiscal year 1995 total includes $11,200,000 provided in the DOD Appropriations Act for military pay raise and $28,297,000 provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Military pay and benefits.—The Committee has concurred with the House's recommendation which reduces the general detail account, also known as the overhead account, from the requested level of $174,812,000 to $171,812,000. In addition, under the military pay and benefits line, the Committee has concurred with the House's initiative to separate the leased housing payments from the "Military pay and benefits" account, to create its own subaccount. The reductions associated with these two moves is $17,900,000. The Committee has restored the $1,401,000 which was cut by the House. This would restore the military pay raise to the 2.4 percent which was requested in the administration's request.

Though the Committee supports the military essentiality initiative, which would where possible convert military positions to civilian positions, it does not include a reduction of $1,000,000, which the House estimates would be saved if 65 positions were converted from military to civilian.

Civilian pay and benefits.—The Committee has provided $176,438,000 for civilian pay and benefits. The Committee's reduction of $825,000, which was also included by the House, would reduce the youth opportunity staffing request. The Committee does not agree with the House's position which recommended an additional $1,000,000 above the budget request for the Coast Guard to hire 10 additional Senior Executive Service staffing positions. The Committee believes that, if the Commandant of the Coast Guard thought it was the best use of his resources to hire additional SES staff, he would so inform the Committee and request it in the budget.

Medical care and equipment.—The Committee has provided the full amount requested for medical care and equipment, which is $6,300,000 above that provided by the House. The Committee feels that the Coast Guard has done a good job to keep its medical care and equipment line item under budget. In fact, this account has seen a slight decrease from the amount of resources required in fiscal year 1995.

Activitywide adjustments.—The Committee has reduced the overall "Pay and allowances" account by $8,000,000, with the admonition to the Coast Guard to accelerate its existing streamlining and restructuring plans where possible without jeopardizing safety-related operations. The House had included a reduction of $4,850,000 associated with accelerating the existing streamlining plan, and $5,000,000 associated with the acceleration of its 1997 restructuring plan.

DEPOT LEVEL MAINTENANCE

Shore facilities.—The Committee has made only one small adjustment to the overall depot level maintenance request, which was $365,316,000. That adjustment was to hold the depot level maintenance for shore facilities request to the fiscal year 1995 level. In each of the other depot level budgets, the fiscal year 1996 request was below the amount of funding required in 1995; and the Committee has, in those items, provided the full amount requested.

OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT

Area operations and support

Cutters.—The Committee has provided the full amount requested for the medium endurance [WMEC] and polar [WAGB] cutters. The Committee has held the funding for the high endurance [WHEC] cutters to the fiscal year 1995 level.

Area offices.—The Committee has held the funding level for area offices to the 1995 enacted level, which results in a reduction of $23,000 from the fiscal year 1996 request.

Maintenance and logistics commands.—The Committee has held the maintenance and logistics commands funding level to $122,882,000, which was the fiscal year 1995 resource level. This

results in a reduction of $734,000 from the request. The Committee has also taken the same position for communications stations, and held it to the fiscal year 1995 level of $3,107,000, a slight reduction of $55,000 from the request.

District operations and support/district offices

The Committee has restored funding for the district offices, and does not agree with the specific cut of $5,600,000 directed by the House. The Committee has provided the full amount requested, which was $56,641,000. The Committee agrees with the House's observation that the Coast Guard does have an extensive field organization, including districts, area commands, groups, bases, stations, and maintenance and logistics command centers. However, the Committee feels strongly that, if consolidations and streamlining are to take place, the Coast Guard itself may be in the best position to judge which offices and district operations may be reduced.

Others.—For other district operations and support activities, the Committee has essentially provided either the budget request, which in many cases was below the fiscal year 1995 funding level, or rolled the funding level back to the 1995 level.

RECRUITING AND TRAINING SUPPORT

The recruiting and training support category has several subsets, including recruiting, training centers (Yorktown and Petaluma), the Coast Guard Academy, and professional training and education. The Committee has provided the full amount requested, which was $70,943,000, and notes that the Coast Guard has again requested a fiscal year 1996 funding level which was below the amount provided in 1995. The Committee has restored the $1,000,000 cut which the House took out of graduate school tuition payments. The Committee believes that the Coast Guard has done a good job in trying to hold costs down whenever and wherever possible, and though its budget for professional training and education is sizable, at $26,207,000, a targeted cut is not necessary at this time.

CENTRALIZED SERVICES AND SUPPORT

The centralized services and support line item includes a number of individual activities. The Committee has provided $187,335,000 overall for centralized services and support, a reduction of $2,391,000 from the requested level (−1.3 percent). The reductions in this activity include a slight reduction of $19,000 from the telecommunications and information systems command request; a reduction of $160,000 from the FTS 2000 telecommunications request; and a $325,000 reduction from the headquarters administration line item (a three-tenths-of-1 percent cut).

Even though the House's staffing positions list is only a suggestion, the Committee believes that the Commandant should have full discretion in the number of positions/billets assigned to each of the offices within headquarters.

ACCOUNTWIDE ADJUSTMENTS

Because of budget constraints, the Committee found it necessary to impose an accountwide adjustment for Coast Guard operations. The Committee agrees with the specific recommendations of the House, which includes the following:

Recreational equipment reduction	−$146,000
Nonpay inflation adjustment	−5,842,000
Nonoperational travel reduction	−1,831,000

And, the Committee has an undistributed accountwide adjustment of $329,000. The Committee does not support the House's observation that the military pay and personnel center could save $500,000 by contracting out operations. This was based on testimony early in the year by the Inspector General's Office, for which the Committee can find no basis, and, therefore, does not support the House's initiative in this area.

In assessing the accountwide adjustment, the Committee directs the Coast Guard to look carefully at whether cost savings could be achieved on vehicles loaned or leased from the General Services Administration. The inspector general's audit of this activity disclosed that 45 percent of the Coast Guard's leased vehicles did not meet GSA's minimum mileage use requirements during fiscal year 1993; and that the required vehicle retention justifications were not maintained or were not adequate to support the retention of 66 percent of the 279 leased vehicles sampled during the audit; and, required usage records were not maintained for 59 percent of the 279 vehicles reviewed. The inspector general estimated that, if the Coast Guard eliminated GSA-leased vehicles averaging 500 miles or less monthly at those units with more than one vehicle assigned, approximately $1,000,000 would be saved each year. The Committee directs the Coast Guard to review this situation, and suggests it as a good candidate as the agency makes its accountwide adjustments.

HOUSE-INITIATED BILL PROVISIONS

Motor vehicle purchase.—The Committee concurs with the House's inclusion of bill language which includes a limitation on the purchase of motor vehicles to five, even though the Coast Guard testified that there were no current plans to purchase any motor vehicles during fiscal year 1996. This provision is included to allow the Coast Guard flexibility if the need arises.

Drug enforcement.—The Committee has stricken the House's bill language that specifies that no less than $314,200,000 may be obligated or expended on drug enforcement programs during fiscal year 1996. The Committee notes that this is the amount which was included by the Coast Guard in its budget for drug enforcement activities. However, as important a mission as drug enforcement is, the Coast Guard conducts many important missions, and the Committee feels that a minimum restriction as included by the House could hamper the Coast Guard responding to emergencies and other needs as they arise. Given the Coast Guard's increased responsibilities and activities in many areas, including migrant interdiction, marine safety, marine environmental protection, and search and rescue operations, the Committee, without prejudice,

has struck the House language. The Committee feels the Coast Guard has done its best to estimate the total amount that would be spent on drug law enforcement, and will expend the resources necessary for this very important activity.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE READINESS

The Committee on Appropriations Department of Defense bill includes $300,000,000 for Coast Guard support. These funds are provided by DOD to enable the Secretary of the Navy to provide support for the national defense mission of the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard plays a key role in support of military missions under the U.S. Atlantic and Southern Commands in support of drug interdiction missions, refugee and immigration support, and enforcement and joint military training. The Committee believes, as does the Defense Subcommittee, that these costs should and could be addressed through Defense appropriations. That subcommittee has recommended, and authorized the Secretary of the Navy to provide, up to $300,000,000 in fuel, spare parts, munitions, repair services, and other support activities necessary to maintain the readiness of the Coast Guard so that it may best participate in national defense missions. The services the Secretary of the Navy will make available to the Coast Guard include ship and aviation fuel, spare parts, munitions, ship stores, commissary goods, ship and aircraft repair services, ship and aircraft parts, and other assistance as necessary to ensure the national defense capabilities and readiness of the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard is a cost-effective force which is multimissioned. Its ships, aircraft, shore units, and people have four primary roles: maritime safety, maritime law enforcement, marine environmental protection, and national defense. These roles are complementary and contribute to the Coast Guard's unique niche within the national security community. The value of the Coast Guard forces and their mission experience was clearly evident by their active participation in Operations Desert Shield/Storm in Iraq, and more recently, in operations restore/uphold democracy in Haiti. The Coast Guard is one of the five Armed Forces, and is a full partner on the joint national security team. To be a credible partner, the Coast Guard must maintain a high state of operational readiness. Many parts of the Coast Guard's budget contain funding requests that, if cut, would severely impair the Coast Guard's operational readiness and, therefore, its ability to meet national security commitments.

OTHER

Small boat station/search and rescue.—Besides conducting direct public service such as search and rescue, fisheries law enforcement, and boating while intoxicated enforcement, Coast Guard small boat stations, boats and personnel also perform a preventive role in their operating areas, similar to the cop on the beat. Coast Guard presence is a constant public reminder that encourages safe boating and deters potential violations of law in the maritime arena. These very real, though intangible, benefits were not included in the Coast Guard's analysis of small boat units. The Committee believes that these intangible benefits, when considered with the di-

rect benefits defined by the Coast Guard analysis, outweigh the management efficiencies and budget savings that will result from closing small boat units. The Committee has, therefore, included a general provision, section 358, which disallows the closure of any multimission small boat stations or subunits. Under the Committee's language, the Commandant may implement management efficiencies within the overall small boat system, which may include modifying the operational posture of units.

Marine safety resources.—As part of its budget request for fiscal year 1996, the Coast Guard proposed to eliminate 21 billets from the marine safety program for a savings of $685,000. The Committee believes, however, that, given the extraordinary unmet needs in the marine safety program, the time is not yet right to downsize the number of trained marine safety personnel.

The recently-initiated port State control initiative has placed several additional burdens on most marine safety offices and their marine inspectors. This initiative calls for such inspectors to participate in the targeted boardings of all high-priority vessels. Yet, too often, the limited number of inspectors and their extensive responsibilities has undermined their ability to participate in all such boardings. The recent addition of Panama to the list of substandard flag States targeted for additional boardings will only exacerbate this problem. Given these growing challenges, the Committee has restored $685,000 and 21 billets to the Coast Guard's operating base. The Committee does not, however, expect these funds to be used to restore the same 21 billets slated by the Coast Guard for termination. Rather, the Committee directs that these billets be strategically deployed in a manner determined by the Commandant in order to strengthen the port State control initiative and address other marine safety priorities. The Committee requests that the Commandant submit a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by March 1, 1996, providing a detailed accounting how each of the restored billets and resources will be used and assigned.

Identification of substandard classification societies.—The port State control initiative, as mandated by the Committee, requires the Coast Guard to target its safety boardings on vessels belonging to substandard owners and vessels associated with substandard flag States and substandard classification societies. In April 1994, the Commandant testified that, while lists of substandard owners and flag States had already been developed, a list of substandard classification societies could not be developed until October 1994. As an interim step, the Coast Guard testified that it would target only those classification societies that were not in compliance with the guidelines called for under IMO Resolution A.739(18).

The Committee is greatly disappointed to learn that a new list of substandard classification societies, rather than being available in October 1994, may not be available until the late winter of 1996. The Committee's disappointment is fueled, in part, by its concern that certain classification societies of questionable quality are currently enjoying the presumption of having adequate safety controls solely because they have been determined to be in compliance with the IMO guidelines.

Recent experience with the Coast Guard's boarding activities reveals that substandard ships are still, periodically, being classed by even the most reputable classification societies. However, within the universe of those societies that have been determined to be in compliance with the IMO resolution, certain societies have experienced a disproportionately and unacceptably high number and frequency of safety interventions. As such, the Committee requests the Commandant to redouble his efforts to develop a new list of substandard classification societies. The Committee further requests that, upon completion of this list, he submit a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees detailing the methodology he used in developing this list. This report, which should be provided no later than April 1, 1996, should include appendices providing all available and relevant safety data used to evaluate the adequacy of all major classification societies.

Vessel traffic systems [VTS].—The Committee concurs with the House's direction that the Coast Guard should more fully examine the implementation costs associated with the vessel traffic service VTS 2000 program. Based on General Accounting Office reports, the costs of operating the vessel traffic system would approach approximately $65,000,000 a year, versus the current cost of almost $20,000,000. In addition, it will take significant capital resources to install the equipment in the currently envisioned VTS 2000 program.

In light of the GAO's earlier report on VTS 2000 costs of $310,000,000 to establish and $65,000,000 to operate, the Committee emphatically directs the Coast Guard to review its plans for VTS, including the institution of user fees whereby users would pay the bill for the service provided. Given the budget situation, the Committee cannot support taking on new responsibilities where services are provided free to the users.

The Committee believes it would be wise to study how this system could be developed through a public sector/private sector partnership. As each port is different, privatization may not be the proper model for all the ports in the Coast Guard's plans. However, given the success of the Los Angeles-Long Beach system, which is funded on fees based on size of ships, and is staffed by both civilians and Coast Guard personnel, it appears that this is an excellent model to study and possibly apply to the rest of the VTS 2000 ports.

Marine Fire and Safety Association.—The Committee remains supportive of efforts by the Marine Fire and Safety Association [MFSA] to provide specialized fire fighting training and maintain an oilspill response contingency plan for the Columbia River. The Committee encourages the Secretary to provide funding for MFSA consistent with the authorization.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 1995	$330,437,400	$32,500,000	$362,937,400
Budget estimate, 1996	395,700,000	32,500,000	428,200,000
House allowance	342,675,000	32,500,000	375,175,000
Committee recommendation	[1] 370,400,000	32,500,000	[1] 402,900,000

[1] Includes $36,100,000 in reprogrammed resources.

This appropriation provides for the major acquisition, construction, and improvement of vessels, aircraft, shore units, and aids to navigation operated and maintained by the Coast Guard. Currently, the Coast Guard has in operation approximately 250 cutters, ranging in size from 65-foot tugs to 399-foot polar icebreakers, more than 2,000 boats, and an inventory of more than 200 helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft. The Coast Guard also operates approximately 600 stations, support and supply centers, communications facilities, and other shore units. The Coast Guard provides over 48,000 navigational aids—buoys, fixed aids, lighthouses, and radio navigational stations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The following table summarizes the Committee's programmatic recommendations:

	Fiscal year 1995 enacted	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House program level allowance	Committee recommendation
Vessels	$187,900,000	$203,700,000	$191,200,000	[1] $192,000,000
Aircraft	11,800,000	19,500,000	16,500,000	14,500,000
Other equipment	29,700,000	56,300,000	42,200,000	47,600,000
Shore facilities and aids to navigation	89,350,000	99,800,000	82,275,000	[2] 102,300,000
Personnel and related support	44,187,400	48,900,000	43,000,000	46,500,000
Total	362,937,400	428,200,000	375,175,000	[3] 402,900,000

[1] Includes $14,000,000 in reprogrammed resources.
[2] Includes $22,100,000 in reprogrammed resources.
[3] Includes $36,100,000 in reprogrammed resources.

VESSELS

The Committee recommends $192,000,000 for vessel acquisition and improvement, of which $14,000,000 is made available through prior-year reprogrammings. The projected allocation of these funds is shown in the table below:

VESSELS

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Acquire vessels and equipment:			
Seagoing buoy tender [WLB] replacement	65,000	65,000	65,000
Coastal buoy tender [WLM] replacement	93,000	93,000	93,000

VESSELS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
47-foot motor lifeboat [MLB] replacement project ...	500	500	500
82-foot WPB capability replacement	4,000	.....	[1] 2,000
Follow-on for polar icebreaker replacement	4,300	4,300	[1] 4,300
Buoy boat replacement project	8,500	.....	8,500
Survey and design—cutters and boats	500	500	500
Norwegian crew search/rescue boat	2,000	2,000	[1] 2,000
Self-propelled barge replacement	900	900	[1] 900
Surface search radar replacement project	3,500	3,500	[1] 3,500
Repair, renovate, or improve existing vessels and small boats:			
210-foot medium-endurance cutter [WMEC], major maintenance availability [MMA]	14,500	14,500	10,500
378-foot shipboard command and control	1,300	1,300	[1] 1,300
Configuration management	5,700	5,700	.....
Total (new program level)	203,700	191,200	[2] 192,000

[1] Funded through reprogrammings.
[2] Includes $14,000,000 in reprogrammed resources.

Point class patrol boat replacement project.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 in reprogrammed resources for the *Point* class patrol boat replacement project. The amount provided is $2,000,000 less than the President's request. This project has been delayed due to the requirement to recompete the contract for the lead ship. At this point, it appears likely that the program will carry forward the entire fiscal year 1995 appropriation into either the first or second quarter of fiscal year 1996. The Committee has reduced the amount provided for project management costs in fiscal year 1996 to account for this delay.

Surface search radar replacement project.—The Committee has provided reprogrammed resources to fully fund the President's request for the surface search radar replacement project. However, the Committee is disturbed to learn that the scope of the program may be undergoing substantial change that could increase cost risk. The Committee understands that the financial participation of the Navy in this procurement is now seriously in doubt. This information is especially disturbing since the Committee received a report from the Commandant dated July 14 that cited this project as a joint Navy-Coast Guard procurement and makes no mention of the risk associated with the loss of Navy participation. The Committee would appreciate an informal communication from the Commandant prior to conference committee deliberations on this bill which discusses in detail the outlook for Navy participation in this project, as well as any likely changes in program cost that will result from the loss of Navy participation in this program.

Medium-endurance cutter major maintenance availability [MMA].—The Committee has provided $10,500,000 of the $14,500,000 requested for the major maintenance availability program for the Coast Guard's fleet of 210-foot medium-endurance cutters. This vessel rehabilitation program is conducted at the Coast Guard yard at Curtis Bay, MD. The Committee finds that, by

stretching out the duration of this program, the Coast Guard can better maintain employment levels at the Coast Guard yard and potentially avoid the cost of severance payments to Federal employees at the yard. The Committee recognizes fully its responsibility to finance the remaining costs associated with this program in future years.

Tactical data information system [TACDIS].—The Committee has fully funded the President's request for the installation of this shipboard command and control system on the Coast Guard's fleet of high-endurance cutters [WHEC's]. While this procurement has had a very troubled history, the critical value of this equipment as a command and control tool during AMIO operations around Haiti and Cuba cannot be questioned. The amount provided will be the last increment of funding necessary to complete this program.

Configuration management.—The Committee has not provided the $5,700,000 requested for the configuration management program. The Committee believes that funds provided for this program in prior years will be sufficient to finance an adequate number of cutter configuration reviews in fiscal year 1996.

Reprogrammings.—The Committee has utilized reprogrammed resources to fully fund the President's request for the polar icebreaker replacement follow-on costs. In combination with the reprogrammings cited above, a total of $14,100,000 in reprogrammed resources will be made available from this subaccount to better enable the Committee to finance the Coast Guard's critical vessel needs in fiscal year 1996. These funds will be made available from unobligated balances in the seagoing buoy tender [WLB] replacement project and the coastal buoy tender [WLM] replacement project.

In the last 9 months, the Coast Guard's estimate of unobligated balances to be carried forward into fiscal year 1996 from these two programs has grown from zero to almost $20,000,000. These balances were principally budgeted for contract change orders and economic price adjustments. Rather than being an indication of program difficulties, the fact that these balances have not been required indicates that the Coast Guard's acquisition strategy based on performance-based specifications has, to date, kept program costs under control. Both the Coast Guard and the contractor are to be commended for their initial performance in keeping both the WLB and WLM programs on schedule and within budget. The Committee recognizes that some amount of these balances may be necessary as the Coast Guard takes delivery of its first WLM and WLB hulls in the coming months. As such, the Committee grants the Commandant the flexibility to move unobligated balances between these two programs as they are needed in fiscal year 1996. The Committee expects to be kept informed as to how this flexibility is utilized through the Commandant's quarterly acquisition reports.

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft procurement, the Committee recommends $14,500,000. Funds for aircraft acquisitions are distributed as follows:

AIRCRAFT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Traffic alert and collision avoidance system [TCAS]—phase IV	13,000	10,000	8,000
Global positioning system installation—phase VI	1,900	1,900	1,900
HH–65 helicopter—transmission gearbox upgrade	2,500	2,500	2,500
HC–130 sidelooking airborne radar [SLAR] upgrade	2,100	2,100	2,100
Total	19,500	16,500	14,500

Traffic alert and collision avoidance system [TCAS].—The Committee has provided $8,000,000 for the traffic alert and collision avoidance system [TCAS], $5,000,000 less than the President's request. With the successful installation of this important safety feature in the Coast Guard's fleet of fixed-wing aircraft, this program now proceeds to the much greater challenge of integrating this feature into the Coast Guard's helicopter fleet. To date, there have been no production installations of TCAS in helicopters. The Coast Guard has not yet awarded its helicopter integration contract and the Committee believes that there is likely to be substantial technical and schedule risk associated with this integration effort. As such, the Committee has reduced the President's funding request and will carefully monitor the progress of this integration effort in the coming months.

Sale of surplus Coast Guard aircraft.—The Committee has concurred in bill language requested by the administration allowing funds received from the sale of the Coast Guard's VC–11A and HU–25 aircraft to be credited to this subaccount. The Committee commends the Coast Guard for its recent sale of the VC–11A aircraft and expects to be informed shortly as to how the receipts of the sale will be utilized. Moreover, the Committee encourages the Commandant to market aggressively his fleet of redundant HU–25 Falcon aircraft so that he can better meet the costs of modernizing the Coast Guard's aviation infrastructure.

OTHER EQUIPMENT

The Committee recommends $47,600,000. The following table displays the project allocation:

OTHER EQUIPMENT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Fleet logistics system	3,000	3,000	.....
Marine information for safety and law enforcement [MISLE]	11,000	11,000	11,000
Global maritime distress/safety system—phase III	500	500	500
Differential global positioning system [DGPS] transmitter replacement	1,700	.....	1,700
Vessel traffic services [VTS] 2000	5,000	5,000	2,000

OTHER EQUIPMENT—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Differential global positioning system [DGPS] in 2d District	2,400	.....	2,400
Search and rescue simulation model [SARSIM]	500	500	500
Supply center computer replacement [SCCR]	1,000	1,000	1,000
Vessel navigation training simulator	1,500	1,500	1,500
Conversion of software applications	11,100	6,100	9,000
Vessel traffic services equipment replacement projects	3,000	3,000	3,000
Finance Center information system replacement	2,600	2,600	2,500
Local notice to mariners automation	500	500	500
Communication system [COMMSYS] 2000	11,000	6,000	11,000
Seagoing buoy tender [WLB] and coastal buoy tender [WLM] support facility	1,500	1,500	1,000
Total	56,300	42,200	47,600

Fleet logistics system [FLS].—The Committee has not provided the $3,000,000 requested for the fleet logistics system [FLS]. The Committee continues to have deep-seated concerns regarding this program. The program's cost risk, schedule risk, and technical risk continue to be rated as high. The Committee questions whether the project should award its centralized configuration management [CCM] contract in fiscal year 1996 under such conditions.

Vessel traffic services [VTS] 2000.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 of the $5,000,000 requested for the VTS 2000 program. Consistent with this reduced funding allocation, the Committee directs that the Coast Guard not conduct any site surveys for new systems in fiscal year 1996. It is not at all clear that the anticipated baseline for domestic discretionary spending will allow for the deployment of new VTS 2000 systems at all ports identified with a positive cost/benefit quotient in the Coast Guard's port needs study. As such, the Committee believes the Coast Guard should target available resources on those ports for which surveys have already been completed.

Conversion of software applications.—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 of the $11,100,000 requested for the conversion of software applications. The Committee recognizes that the Coast Guard is required to convert its numerous current software applications to be compatible with an open systems environment. However, the Committee believes that this small funding reduction can be easily accommodated by converting fewer applications in fiscal year 1996. This reduction will not undermine the program over the long run.

Communication system [COMMSYS] 2000.—The Committee takes strong exception to the recommendation of the House to reduce funding below the President's request for the communication system [COMMSYS] 2000 program. This program has already demonstrated its value in reducing the Coast Guard's personnel and operating costs by remoting existing communication stations to consolidated facilities with substantially fewer employees. The Coast Guard's budget request for operating expenses for fiscal year 1996

already assumes some personnel savings associated with this acquisition request. Slowing the progress of this program will only undermine the Coast Guard's ability to eliminate unnecessary personnel and operating costs.

Seagoing buoy tender [WLB] and coastal buoy tender [WLM] support facility.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 of the $1,500,000 requested for the WLB and WLM support facility. Given the delivery schedule for the new buoy tender fleet, the Committee believes that full funding of this $6,500,000 facility may be premature at this time. Moreover, the Committee questions whether an existing Coast Guard facility, such as the Coast Guard yard, might be adequate to meet the needs of this project.

SHORE FACILITIES AND AIDS TO NAVIGATION

The program level recommended is $102,300,000. Within this amount, $22,100,000 is made available through reprogrammed resources. The following table displays the project allocation:

SHORE FACILITIES AND AIDS TO NAVIGATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Shore—General:			
Survey and design of various shore projects	8,000	8,000	6,000
Minor AC&I shore construction projects	5,000	5,000	4,000
Streamlining initiatives—unspecified	5,000	5,000	.....
Shore—Air stations: Streamlining initiative consolidation	11,000	11,000	[1] 11,000
Shore—Supply centers/support centers/yard: Baltimore, MD—Coast Guard yard land-based ship handling facility	15,100	.....	7,000
Shore—Personnel support facilities: Public family quarters	22,700	20,275	[2] 20,000
Shore—Groups/bases/stations/MSO's:			
Station, Boothbay Harbor, ME—renovate/expand	2,800	2,800	2,800
Base, San Juan, PR—reconstruction phase II	3,150	3,150	.....
Base, South Portland, ME—construct station operations building	2,600	2,600	2,600
Station, Port Isabel, TX—reconstruct/expand waterfront facilities	2,650	2,650	2,650
Station, Portage, MI—relocate/replace station facilities	4,200	4,200	4,200
Station, Chetco River, OR—construct mooring/waterfront support facility	2,000	2,000	2,000
Station, Honolulu, HI—replacement	5,000	5,000	5,000
Shore—Streamlining initiatives—project execution costs:			
Wadsworth, NY—Activities New York—construct group/MSO headquarters and vessel traffic control center	.....	.....	9,000
Rosebank, NY—Pier and station rehabilitation	.....	.....	4,000
Bayonne, NJ—Pier improvements and aids to navigation team [ANT]	.....	.....	5,700
Sandy Hook, NJ—Construct group engineering building	.....	.....	2,750
Portsmouth, VA—Integrated support center administrative space	.....	.....	4,000

SHORE FACILITIES AND AIDS TO NAVIGATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Boston, MA—Integrated support center rehabilitation	.....	.....	2,000
Yorktown, VA—Reserve training center—Yeoman school building modifications	.....	.....	1,100
New London, CT—Chief petty officers academy [CPOA] and leadership school	.....	.....	2,500
Training centers: Coast Guard Academy, Roland Hall—renovation	5,100	5,100	.....
Aids to navigation facilities: Waterways aids-to-navigation projects	5,500	5,500	4,000
Total	99,800	82,275	[3] 102,300

[1] Funded through reprogrammings.
[2] Funded through $11,100,000 in reprogrammed resources and $8,900,000 in new budget authority.
[3] Includes $22,100,000 in reprogrammed resources.

Streamlining initiatives.—Over the last several months, the Coast Guard has had under development, a broad-based streamlining plan intended to substantially reduce the Coast Guard's personnel and operating costs, while maintaining the current level of services to the public. This initiative will necessitate considerable investment in reengineering the Coast Guard's existing physical plant so that the expected savings in operating costs can be realized.

While the entire streamlining plan has not yet been finalized, the Committee has worked with the Coast Guard to identify several shore facility projects that can be initiated in fiscal year 1996 to generate operational cost savings in the near term. This was done, in part, out of recognition that the current budget environment will require the Coast Guard to move out on its streamlining plan more expeditiously than originally planned in order to maintain services to the public at reduced funding levels.

It must be noted, however, that in a number of instances, certain shore facility projects that were included in the budget request were required to be reduced, deferred, or canceled in order that funding could be provided to those streamlining projects that would yield near-term operational savings. Such is the case for the Committee's reduced funding recommendations for shore survey and design projects, the Coast Guard yard land-based ship handling facility, minor AC&I projects, public family quarters, base San Juan reconstruction, and ATON waterways projects.

In total, the Committee has provided $42,050,000 for projects associated with Coast Guard streamlining activities as follows:

Shore facility funding for streamlining activities

Wadsworth, NY—Activities New York—construct group/MSO headquarters and vessel traffic control center	$9,000,000
Rosebank, NY—Pier and station rehabilitation	4,000,000
Bayonne, NJ—Pier improvements and aids to navigation team [ANT]	5,700,000
Sandy Hook, NJ—Construct group engineering building	2,750,000
Portsmouth, VA—Integrated support center administrative space	4,000,000
Boston, MA—Integrated support center rehabilitation	2,000,000

Shore facility funding for streamlining activities—Continued

Yorktown, VA—Reserve training center—Yeoman school building modifications	1,100,000
Atlantic City, NJ—Construct hangar for consolidated air stations	11,000,000
New London, CT—Chief petty officers academy [CPOA] and leadership school	2,500,000
Total	42,050,000

The Committee greatly prefers this procedure of providing funding to well-justified, defined projects than the funding approach taken by the House Committee. Under the House's recommendation, the Commandant is provided with blanket reprogramming authority of up to $50,000,000 to finance these projects. The Committee believes that, under the House's approach, the Congress will not have adequate opportunity to review and approve individual aspects of the Coast Guard's streamlining plan. The Committee recognizes that additional funds may be required in fiscal year 1996 to finance all the streamlining activities that the Coast Guard may want to initiate in fiscal year 1996. The Committee will give full consideration to such reprogramming requests throughout the year on a case-by-case basis.

Coast Guard yard land-based ship handling facility.—The Committee takes great exception to the recommendation of the House to provide no funding for this request. The current ship handling capability at the Coast Guard yard is clearly inadequate and is in need of modernization. The Committee, in consultation with the Coast Guard, has determined that this project can be executed over several phases. The first phase will require an appropriation of $7,000,000 which the Committee has fully funded. This funding will be used for the purchase of lift equipment and associated waterfront work. The Committee recognizes that additional funding will be required in fiscal year 1997 to finance more land-based work associated with this project. Providing the necessary funding in two phases will not delay the completion date for this project.

Personnel support facilities—public family quarters.—As stated above, funding for this activity was necessarily reduced. The Committee recommendation assumes that phase II of the housing project at Cape Hatteras, NC, will be deferred.

Roland Hall renovation.—The Committee has not funded the $5,100,000 requested for the renovation of the Roland Hall gymnasium building at the Coast Guard Academy in New London, CT. While the Committee does not belittle the importance of the Academy's critical training function, the current budgetary environment does not allow for the financing of new or renovated athletic facilities. Given the overwhelming unmet need to rehabilitate facilities that are essential to the Coast Guard's critical operational missions, the Committee cannot support funding for gymnasium renovations at this time.

Reprogrammings.—The Committee has utilized reprogrammed resources to fully finance the $11,000,000 requested for the consolidation of two existing air stations and $11,100,000 of the $20,000,000 provided for public family quarters. These funds are to be made available from the following sources:

Fiscal year:	
1994: Cape May barracks savings	$1,500,000

1995:	
Base San Juan reconstruction	10,750,000
Overseas loran closures	6,000,000
Station Ocracoke housing	2,100,000
Various: General shore project savings	1,750,000

PERSONNEL AND RELATED SUPPORT

The program level recommended is $46,500,000. Within the amount provided, $500,000 shall be for core acquisition costs. The House provided a total of $43,000,000, of which $500,000 was for core acquisition costs. The House capped positions at 717, which is the same level as that provided in fiscal year 1995.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

Appropriations, 1995	$23,497,300
Budget estimate, 1996	25,000,000
House allowance	21,000,000
Committee recommendation	21,000,000

The Committee recommends funding of $21,000,000 to continue the environmental restoration and compliance-related actions throughout the Coast Guard.

These fiscal year 1996 funds will be used to address environmental problems at former and current Coast Guard units as required by applicable Federal, State, and local environmental laws and regulations. Planned expenditures for these funds include major upgrades to petroleum and regulated-substance storage tanks, restoration of contaminated ground water and soils, remediation efforts at hazardous substance disposal sites, and initial site surveys.

The Committee is aware that lead-acid batteries have been dumped by the U.S. Coast Guard in Lake Memphremagog and Lake Champlain, VT. EPA guidelines and title 24, section 2201 of Vermont Statutes prohibit such dumping of lead-acid batteries. These batteries contain lead and mercury that can pose a threat to water quality and to the fish and people that ingest it. Already Lake Champlain contains levels of mercury high enough to require health warnings for pregnant women, children, and the elderly who eat fish from the lake.

The Committee requests the U.S. Coast Guard to prepare a report to the Committee no later than 30 days after passage of this act that details past incidents of battery dumping in Lake Memphremagog, Lake Champlain, and other navigable waters of Vermont. This report should include the number of batteries dumped, their lead and mercury content, and the location and date of their dumping. The report should also include a description of the Coast Guard's current practice of battery disposal, the cleanup planned for existing dump sites in Vermont, and an assessment of the health risk posed by these batteries. In determining the health risk, the Coast Guard will take into consideration varying conditions that could affect the release of pollutants such as freezing conditions.

PORT SAFETY DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	$15,000,000

The Committee has included funding to support infrastructure-related development at the Port of Portland, OR, including reduction of debt from prior infrastructure development guaranteed by local taxpayers. Recent legislation allows Alaska North Slope oil to be exported rather than be used exclusively for domestic purposes. This change in Federal policy jeopardizes substantial investments made by the port in response to anticipated increases in demand. Because of increased repair work and dockings, substantial sums were borrowed to make infrastructure improvements necessary to satisfy capacity, safety, and environmental issues. Recent congressional action jeopardizes the port's expected cash flow and impairs its ability to make orderly payments on debt retirement. This appropriation will allow the port to retire some of the debt.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	$2,000,000
House allowance	16,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,000,000

The "Alteration of bridges" appropriation provides funds for the Coast Guard's share of the cost of altering or removing bridges obstructive to navigation. Under the provisions of the Truman-Hobbs Act of June 21, 1940, as amended (33 U.S.C. 511 et seq.), the Coast Guard, as the Federal Government's agent, is required to share with owners the cost of altering railroad and publicly owned highway bridges which obstruct the free movement of navigation on navigable waters of the United States in accordance with the formula established in 33 U.S.C. 516.

Beginning in 1995, the administration decided that the Coast Guard could no longer fund the alteration of highway bridges determined to be unreasonable obstructions to navigation. The Federal share of such projects would be financed from bridge program funds of the Federal Highway Administration [FHWA], under the continuing direction of the Coast Guard.

Funding of $2,000,000 was requested by the administration to continue work on the Burlington Northern Railroad bridge over the Mississippi River at Burlington, IA. According to the administration's budget justification, FHWA discretionary bridge funds will continue the alteration of highway bridges at Brunswick, GA; Chelsea, MA; the Port of New Orleans, LA; and, to begin work in Limehouse, SC.

The House provides funding for the Burlington, IA, bridge as requested. The House, however, provides the following unrequested funds:

New Orleans, LA, Florida Avenue, railroad/highway bridge	$2,000,000
Brunswick, GA, Sidney Lanier Highway Bridge	8,000,000
Boston, MA, Chelsea Street Highway Bridge	2,000,000
St. John's, SC, Limehouse Highway Bridge	2,000,000

RETIRED PAY

Appropriations, 1995	$562,585,000
Budget estimate, 1996	582,022,000
House allowance	582,022,000
Committee recommendation	582,022,000

The "Retired pay" appropriation provides for retired pay of military personnel of the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve, members of the former Lighthouse Service, and for annuities payable to beneficiaries of retired military personnel under the retired serviceman's family protection plan (10 U.S.C. 1431–1446) and survivor benefit plan (10 U.S.C. 1447–1455), and for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act. The average number of personnel on the retired rolls is estimated to be 29,450 in fiscal year 1996, as compared with an estimated 28,493 in fiscal year 1995 and 27,778 in fiscal year 1994.

The bill includes $582,022,000 for retired pay, which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

RESERVE TRAINING

Appropriations, 1995	$64,976,725
Budget estimate, 1996	64,859,000
House allowance	61,859,000
Committee recommendation	62,000,000

Under the provisions of 14 U.S.C. 145, the Secretary of Transportation is required to adequately support the development and training of a Reserve force to ensure that the Coast Guard will be sufficiently organized, manned, and equipped to fully perform its wartime missions. The purpose of the Reserve training program is to provide trained units and qualified persons for active duty in the Coast Guard in time of war or national emergency, or at such other times as the national security requires. Coast Guard reservists must also train for mobilization assignments that are unique to the Coast Guard in times of war, such as port security operations associated with the Coast Guard's Maritime Defense Zone [MDZ] mission and include deployable port security units.

The Committee has provided $62,000,000 for Reserve training. The amount provided is $2,859,000 less than the President's request. The amount provided will support a Selected Reserve Force of 8,000 members, the same level as fiscal year 1995.

The Coast Guard is provided Reserve training funding as follows:

Functional program element	President's request (8000 SELRES)	Committee recommendation (8000 SELRES)
Drill pay and benefits	$25,343,000	24,600,000
Full-time support personnel	20,254,000	19,400,000
Annual training program	10,361,000	9,700,000
District administration/training	4,241,000	4,050,000
Recruiting	1,783,000	1,500,000
O/M support to training facilities	1,648,000	1,575,000
Headquarters administration	1,229,000	1,175,000
Total	64,859,000	62,000,000

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 1995	$17,156,000	$3,150,000	$20,306,400
Budget estimate, 1996	19,350,000	3,150,000	22,500,000
House allowance	15,350,000	3,150,000	18,500,000
Committee recommendation	16,850,000	3,150,000	20,000,000

The Coast Guard's Research and Development Program seeks to improve the tools and techniques with which Coast Guard carries out its varied operational missions and to increase the knowledge base upon which it depends to fulfill its regulatory responsibilities.

The bill includes $20,000,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation, which is $2,500,000 below the budget request and $1,500,000 above the House allowance.

The Committee recommendation for funding distribution is as follows:

	Fiscal year 1995	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Budget data:				
Search and rescue	$860,000	$500,000	$500,000	$500,000
Aids to navigation	1,325,000	1,950,000	1,250,000	1,325,000
Marine safety	1,415,000	3,425,000	1,650,000	2,000,000
Marine environmental protection	1,300,000	1,075,000	725,000	1,075,000
Enforcement of laws and treaties	600,000	725,000	725,000	725,000
Mission capabilities assessment	2,020,000	1,795,000	1,706,000	1,780,000
Multimission/administrative support	12,786,400	13,030,000	11,944,000	12,595,000
Total	20,306,400	22,500,000	18,500,000	20,000,000

BOAT SAFETY

(AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	$25,000,000
Budget estimate, 1996[1]	
House allowance	20,000,000
Committee recommendation	

[1] The President's budget proposed, contingent on enactment of legislation, that $30,000,000 be available as a direct (mandatory) program and no discretionary funds.

This account provides financial assistance for a coordinated National Recreational Boating Safety Program for the several States. Title 46, United States Code, section 13106, establishes a "Boat safety" account from which the Secretary may allocate and distribute matching funds to assist in the development, administration, and financing of qualifying State programs. The "Boat safety" account consists of amounts transferred from the highway trust fund which are derived from the motorboat fuel tax (18.4 cents per gallon). The President's budget requests no discretionary funding in 1996.

The President's request proposed to provide all funding for the State boating safety grant program by increasing from $10,000,000 to $30,000,000 the amount of mandatory funding from the "Sport

fish restoration'' account as authorized under the Clean Vessel Act of 1992 (title V of the Oceans Act of 1992).

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1996 PROGRAM

The Federal Aviation Administration traces its origins to the Air Commerce Act of 1926, but more recently to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which established the independent Federal Aviation Agency from functions which had resided in the Airways Modernization Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and parts of the Civil Aeronautics Board. FAA became an administration of the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967, pursuant to the Department of Transportation Act (October 15, 1966).

The total recommended program level for the FAA for fiscal year 1996 amounts to $7,846,263,000 including a $1,250,000,000 obligation limitation on the use of contract authority for the Airport Grants Program. The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1995 enacted	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Operations	[1] 4,582,522	4,704,000	4,600,000	4,550,000
Facilities and equipment	[2] 2,087,489	[3] 1,917,847	2,000,000	1,890,377
Rescission	−35,000	.....	−60,000	−70,000
Research, engineering, and development	259,192	267,661	143,000	215,886
Grants-in-aid for airports	[4] 1,450,000	[5] (218,028)	1,600,000	1,250,000
Total	8,344,203	7,107,536	8,283,000	7,836,263

[1] Includes reductions pursuant to sections 330 and 331 of Public Law 103–331 and amounts transferred to OST, salaries and expenses for civil rights activities.
[2] Excludes $55,000,000 reduction of unobligated balances for procurement and procurement-related expenses canceled pursuant to section 323 of Public Law 103–331.
[3] Includes budget amendment of $10,000,000 for advanced security equipment.
[4] Limitation on obligations.
[5] Funding for existing airport grant letters of intent included under Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program within the line item prior commitments.

OPERATIONS

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 1995	$2,132,272,300	$2,450,250,000	$4,582,522,300
Budget estimate, 1996	2,094,877,000	2,609,123,000	4,704,000,000
House allowance	2,728,500,000	1,871,500,000	4,600,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,685,000,000	1,865,000,000	4,550,000,000

FAA's ''Operations'' appropriation provides funds for the operation, maintenance, communications, and logistic support of the air traffic control and navigation systems and activities. It also covers the administration and management of the regulatory, airports, medical and engineering and development programs.

The bill includes a total of $4,550,000,000 for the operations activities of the Federal Aviation Administration, of which

$1,865,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. The account total is $32,522,300 more than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995.

As in past years, FAA is directed to report immediately to the Committees on Appropriations in the event resources are insufficient to operate a safe and effective air traffic control system.

The activities of the operations accounts comprise 12 main areas:

Operation of air traffic control system.—The operation of a national system of air traffic management in the United States, its territories, and its possessions on a 24-hour basis.

NAS logistics support.—Procurement, contracting, and materiel management programs; administrative communications; supply; and other logistics support.

Maintenance of air traffic control system.—The direction and engineering services related to the maintenance, improvement, and modification of facilities and equipment in the traffic control system; and technical operation and maintenance of a national network of air navigation aids and traffic control facilities.

Leased telecommunications services.—Finances the noncapital costs of FAA's operational and administrative telecommunications systems.

Aviation regulation and certifications.—The promotion of flight safety of civil aircraft by assuring the airworthiness of aircraft; the competence of pilots, aviators, and aviator technicians; the adequacy of flight procedures and air operations; and the evaluation of inflight facility performance for compliance with prescribed standards.

Aviation standards.—Includes the airmen and aircraft registry, aviation medicine, and the care and maintenance of FAA's aircraft fleet.

Aviation security.—Provides for the overall planning, direction, management, evaluation, and enforcement of civil aviation security; supports efforts covering the investigation and interdiction of illegal drugs and the assessment of foreign airports.

NAS design and management.—Provides technical and administrative program management for the NAS plan; and the planning, direction, and evaluation of the research, engineering, and development program (excluding aviation medicine), direct project costs of which are financed under the research, engineering, and development appropriation.

Administration of airports.—Provides for the administration of airport grants and the safety inspection and certification of the Nation's airports.

Human resources management.—Administration of employee recruitment, development, compensation, training, and labor-management relations programs.

Executive direction and management.—Funds the administrative functions that establish policy and direct and develop programs which provide for the following administrative services: policy and plans, accounting, budget, civil rights, international aviation, data systems; public affairs; information technology; executive directors; and legal counsel. This is a new activity, combining two previously separate, administrative activities—headquarters administration and the direction staff and supporting services. This consolidation

will streamline operations, save resources, and provide FAA management with greater flexibility.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendation in comparison to the budget estimate and House allowance:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1995 program level [1]	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendations
Operation of air traffic control system	2,200,319	2,228,634	2,220,324	2,200,324
NAS logistics support	175,665	185,158	186,058	180,665
Maintenance of air traffic control system	842,331	868,297	866,197	864,695
Leased telecommunications services	316,793	328,423	321,743	326,345
Aviation regulation and certification	361,119	399,711	383,950	390,450
Aviation standards	108,751	111,395	108,751	108,751
Aviation security	63,933	65,769	64,849	65,000
NAS design and management	54,078	53,277	45,000	53,000
Administration of airports	39,299	42,173	41,530	41,500
Commercial space transportation	.....	6,541	5,770	5,770
Human resource management	229,964	231,947	200,005	208,500
Executive direction and management	190,270	189,216	175,000	180,000
Accountwide adjustments	.....	.....	−19,177	−65,000
Offsetting receipts	.....	.....	.....	−10,000
Total	4,582,522	4,710,541	4,600,000	4,550,000

[1] Excludes $916,000 carryover from prior years.

OPERATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM

The Committee recommends a total of $2,200,324,000 for the operation of the national air traffic control and flight service system. This is $28,310,000 less than the budget estimate and the same as the fiscal year 1995 level.

Over the next decade, the Committee expects to see the billions of dollars of new technology being developed, procured, and implemented under the ''Facilities and equipment'' account—computers, communications equipment, and information analysis capability—reflected in a trend toward more productive work forces and, therefore, lower operations budget estimates.

The major activities under operation of air traffic control system include:

NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM LOGISTICS SUPPORT

The Committee notes shortfalls in funding in the logistics activity during earlier years due to the delay of new systems coming online. However, in accordance with information provided by FAA, the Committee recommends a more modest increase of $5,000,000 for this activity over the 1995 program level. This increase would bring the total recommended for this budget activity to $180,665,000.

MAINTENANCE OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM

The Committee recommends $864,695,000 and 9,302 FTE's for this budget activity. The Committee has reduced the $3,602,000 associated with undefined inflationary increases.

LEASED TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES

The Committee recommends $326,345,000 for this budget activity. The Committee does not agree with the House recommendation to reduce funding for leased communications activities. Because of delays in developing new communications systems and reductions in funding for others, the Committee recommends restoration of $4,602,000 for FAA's leased telecommunication services. The Committee expects that, in general, costs for leased telecommunication services will decline in future years when new and more advanced technology is in place.

AVIATION REGULATION AND CERTIFICATION

The Committee recommends $390,450,000 and 4,600 full-time permanent positions for this activity. The Committee disagrees with the House's recommendation for eliminating funding for the Omega navigation system and has restored $6,500,000 for FAA to assume operation of the system which the Coast Guard is dropping. The Committee expects that Federal funding for Omega will soon be eliminated and supported through user fees.

AVIATION STANDARDS

The Committee agrees with the House's recommendation for aviation standards, which is $108,751,000, the same as the fiscal year 1995 level.

CIVIL AVIATION SECURITY

The Committee recommends $65,000,000 and 790 FTE's for this budget activity.

NAS DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends $53,000,000 and 495 FTE's for this budget activity, which is actually a 2-percent reduction from the fiscal year 1995 enacted level.

Out of the funds provided, the Committee expects FAA to continue its contribution for firefighting and emergency services at the Atlantic City International Airport, either alone or in conjunction with the New Jersey Air National Guard.

ADMINISTRATION OF AIRPORTS

The Committee concurs with the House reduction and recommends $41,500,000 and 495 FTE's for this activity.

The Committee agrees with the House's including 20 new positions for airport inspection and three new positions for management improvements. The Committee, however, has only included five new positions for compliance.

COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION

A budget amendment proposed transfer of funding for this activity from the Office of the Secretary. This activity finances regulatory activities, research and development, and studies needed to carry out the Secretary's responsibilities as defined in Executive Order 12465 to encourage, facilitate, and promote commercial space launches by the U.S. private sector and to license and regulate commercial launches, launch site operations, and certain payloads under the Commercial Space Launch Act (Public Law 98–575).

The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $5,770,000 and 32 FTE's for this activity

HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends $208,500,000 and 1,170 FTE's for this budget activity. The Committee has not included unrequested funds for the Mid-American Aviation Resource Consortium.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTION AND MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends $180,000,000 and 1,734 FTE's for this budget activity, a reduction of $9,216,000 from the requested amount. The Committee has made this reduction due to budget constraints.

ACCOUNTWIDE ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee generally agrees with the thrust of the House's approach making accountwide adjustments in order to bring the overall ''FAA operations budget'' account within the budget constraints faced by that Committee and this Committee in putting together a fiscal year 1996 bill. However, the Committee does not agree with the recommendation to terminate funding for the Society of Automotive Engineers. This small research grant of $105,000 is well spent.

The SAE is a major source of performance standards which are used by the FAA for certification requirements for aircraft components. SAE provides the technical organization and expertise necessary to develop and maintain these standards at the request of FAA. The organization has been developing standards and recommending practices to FAA and the aviation industry since 1947.

The Committee does agree with the House regarding holding the permanent change of station funding to the fiscal year 1995 level. FAA has appealed that an increase in this line item is necessary to meet minimal permanent change of station requirements. However, the Committee is concerned about the administration of the permanent change of station program, and finds it hard to believe, as reported in newspaper articles, that FAA reported on June 14 that $2,500,000 was set aside to simply cover personal relocation costs for employees who transferred from Stapleton Airport to Denver International. These airports are approximately 17 miles apart from each other and are connected by a modern, four-lane divided highway. The Committee does not have information regarding the number of controllers who used the benefit, or the approximate cost

of each move, but finds it very difficult to defend a cost of $2,500,000 for a movement of employees 17 miles.

Operational differential pay.—United States Code provides various types of premium pay for air traffic controllers. A major cost for the FAA, approximately $90,000,000, is associated with the 5-percent operational differential, which is known as the air traffic controllers strike pay replacement. These funds were originally intended to rehire air traffic controllers immediately following the 1981 PATCO strike as an incentive to attract new employees. Fourteen years later, this pay differential is included in the base of FAA, and no longer serves as an incentive, a differential, or a promotion to attract new controllers.

The Committee has seen in the controller pay area many programs originally started as temporary programs become instituted in the pay baseline, such as this pay differential, and the hard-to-staff pay demonstration program, which was also extended.

Air traffic controllers pay has several other operational differentials in existence, including a 1.6-percent premium pay for controllers at centers and terminals who are certified as proficient to perform duties including the separation and control of aircraft, even though not required to be so certified as a condition of employment.

There is also a 10-percent premium pay to controllers who are providing on the job training to another controller while the trainee is directly involved in the operation and control of air traffic. And there is a 25-percent premium pay to a controller or flight service station specialist required by his supervisor to work through the fourth through sixth hour of a regular 8-hour day without a 30-minute meal break.

There are reasons for a number of these pay differentials, and in many cases they serve a worthwhile purpose or are a protection of employees rights. But given the budget constraints this Committee faces, it is incumbent upon the FAA to get a better handle on its administrative and pay costs, including differentials that may be outdated and unnecessary as we move toward a more independent operation. Differentials are in addition to overtime pay, night differentials, holiday pay, Sunday pay, locality pay, and the hard-to-staff pay, all of which are part of the personnel, benefits, and computation factor.

This is not intended as criticism of controllers. In fact, the job they perform is outstanding, given the conditions under which they have to work. Outmoded equipment, equipment failure, and overcrowded workspace are just some of the conditions that have to be endured. It is contingent upon the FAA and the controllers to work together to alleviate the staff shortages that exist at some stations and the equally inefficient surplus of controllers at other facilities. Agreed-upon staffing standards, implemented through a rational change of station process, would help.

All told, the Committee has included accountwide adjustments of $65,000,000, of which approximately $45,000,000 is attributable to a 50-percent reduction in the operational pay differential. The sum of $5,000,000 is reduced to hold the inflation nonpay adjustment of the operations account to a 1.5-percent increase above the fiscal year 1995 level, and through expected savings on the disposition

and/or use of administrative aircraft and leased and purchased GSA vehicles.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS AND ISSUES

Offsetting collections.—The Committee has included bill language within the FAA operations account to allow the agency to collect up to $10,000,000 in offsetting collections, which would be used to offset the proposed budget cuts. Collections would be deposited into the "FAA operations" account for use by the agency without further appropriation.

The Committee believes that there are numerous areas for new or expanded user fees within the FAA. Imposition of fees in some or all of the following areas: Standards, regulation and certification, and security, should be implemented to allow FAA to at least cover the full cost of its activities.

Aviation standards.—There are approximately 270,000 airmen certification examinations, and based on the information provided by the agency, the current fees for conducting these examinations do not cover the full costs.

There are also approximately 250,000 aircraft registration examinations conducted where the current fees do not cover the full costs of the examinations. In addition, there are approximately 495,000 airmen medical certificates processed by FAA, and the Committee strongly believes that all such certificate and examination fees should cover the costs for administering them.

Aviation regulation and certification.—In the aviation regulation and certification area, once again the fees do not recover the full costs. There are approximately 380,000 airman and operator certificates in existence, and the fees collected do not cover the full cost for administering the program. In addition, there are approximately 8,000 new aircraft and/or parts or avionics certificated by the agency. The current fees for providing this service do not recover the full cost. There are in existence 3,500 airworthiness certificates which the administration does not charge the full cost for administering. Approximately 400,000 inspections are conducted in the aviation regulation and certification area, and it is not clear to the Committee that the FAA recovers the cost of the program.

Aviation security.—The Committee is aware that the FAA does not fully cover the cost for administering the security program. There are over 11,000 domestic air carrier and 3,000 foreign carrier inspections at U.S. airports conducted annually. There are over 870 foreign airport/foreign carrier inspections conducted by FAA's foreign stations.

There are nearly 4,500 hazardous materials inspections conducted; and, in addition, the agency conducts about 11,000 DUI/DWI pilot investigations for which no fees are assessed.

In addition, the Committee believes that FAA should look at the costs involved with administering the air tariff data base, and if warranted, prescribe a schedule of fees to cover the costs of carrying out the air tariff data base, which obtains and processes tariffs showing the prices of foreign air transportation.

Given the number of examinations, inspections, certifications, and investigations conducted by the agency, the Committee be-

lieves that the agency should be able to recover the $10,000,000 which was allowed in the bill language.

Diamond Head FAA combined center radar approach control [CENRAP] relocation.—In fiscal year 1994, Congress instructed the FAA to fund the relocation of its facility out of Diamond Head crater. In fiscal year 1995, Congress instructed the FAA to complete the site acquisition for this relocation. There has been no progress toward fulfilling these mandates. Accordingly, this Committee directs the FAA to report within 3 months what specific steps it will take to acquire a new site for this facility and complete its relocation.

Installation of next generation weather radar [Nexrad].—In fiscal year 1993, this Committee directed the FAA to install Nexrad equipment originally requested for DOD facilities that are closed or scheduled for immediate closure to cover the southern flank of the Island of Hawaii, and to expedite the deployment of the original three Nexrad's for the Hawaiian Islands. The Committee is disappointed to learn that, to date, only two of the four Nexrad's designated for Hawaii have been installed and that the FAA has no intention of installing the fourth Nexrad designated for the southern flank of the Island of Hawaii. The blatant disregard by the FAA of this congressional mandate is unacceptable. Accordingly, this Committee directs the FAA to report within 3 months what specific steps it will take to deploy the two remaining Nexrad's designated for the State of Hawaii.

Martinsburg Airport surveillance radar installation.—The Committee is disturbed by the delays experienced in the installation of a new airport surveillance radar [ASR–9] at Martinsburg, WV. Schedules supplied to the Committee indicate that this critical equipment enhancement may not be completed until a full 7 years following the initiation of funding for the project. The Committee finds these delays to be unacceptable and requests the Administrator to redouble his efforts to ensure the timely completion of this project at the earliest possible opportunity.

Loran-C.—The Committee has previously indicated that FAA should take full advantage of the compatibility of loran with GPS, and believes that loran can be used as a cost-effective alternative system to GPS until satellite technology is available as a sole means of safe and efficient navigation. Total system infrastructure operations and maintenance costs are about $17,000,000 annually. The technology is established, operationally proven, reliable, and cost effective. In view of the favorable benefits versus costs associated with loran and because of the enhancement it provides to user safety, the Committee concurs with the House report language which calls for a plan that addresses future funding for loran in cooperation with other Federal entities both within and outside of DOT. Given advances in GPS, the Committee expects decreased funding in future years for this navigation system. The Committee does not support expedited implementation of the automatic blink system, pending receipt of the requested funding plan. Given the budget outlook for the future, FAA should address its role with less resources.

Aeronautical charts.—The Committee understands that the FAA is currently exploring the possibility of assuming responsibility

from NOAA for producing and distributing aeronautical charts. The Committee further understands that NOAA is amenable to such an arrangement and is involved in the discussions. We encourage these discussions, and look forward to working with FAA and NOAA to develop a final proposal. Based on preliminary data, the Committee is concerned that the total NOAA costs for the program run to approximately $38,000,000, which includes: $16,000,000 for FAA-related reimbursements; $8,100,000 for Defense Mapping Agency related needs; $2,000,000 of retained revenues; and $11,700,000 in appropriated funds to cover nonreimbursed costs.

Federal surplus personal property for public airport purposes.—The Committee directs the FAA to continue its administration of the Federal Surplus Personal Property Program. The Committee believes that this program is of particular importance to smaller airports, in that it reduces equipment acquisition costs associated with federally mandated programs. The Committee urges the FAA to work with the General Services Administration to ensure that airports are receiving the highest priority available to Federal grant recipients; and work with industry to ensure that the property is distributed in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

Contract tower program.—In recent years, the Committee has provided resources to expand and streamline the level I contract tower program because of the substantial budgetary savings that can result for the Federal Government and users. The Committee has found that air traffic services at these facilities are safe and efficient and there is also the same positive effect on airport growth as at FAA-staffed facilities. In our current austere budgetary situation, it is important to continue support steps to assure that the program remains cost effective.

The Committee is concerned that the current approach to wage determinations at contract tower facilities may significantly increase the cost of the program. Because an important objective is to contain expenses and ensure the ongoing success of the program, the Committee believes additional action is warranted. Therefore, the Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with the Secretary of Labor, is directed to initiate any action necessary to discontinue prospective or retroactive wage determinations for professional employees at all level I contract tower locations where there are five or fewer employees, as provided for in the Service Contract Act of 1965.

Cape Girardeau, MO.—It is the Committee's understanding that the Cape Girardeau location is being operated by the city at a cost that is 30 percent less than is typical for many other facilities included in the contract tower program, and can be used as a model for operating such facilities at low cost to the Federal Government.

The Committee understands that this facility should have a benefit/cost ratio exceeding 1.0 in the near future. Moreover, this facility has been utilized as an emergency transportation center for hundreds of flood disaster relief aircraft in recent years as a staging point for Coast Guard and other military emergency operations. Also, as the site for emergency earthquake relief training exercises, as the designated airport center of operations in the event of earthquake activity on the new madrid fault. The Committee directs

FAA to review the benefit/cost ratio of this facility and to continue funding of the facility during this review.

Controller training.—For many years, the FAA has trained air traffic controllers at its largest facilities using an outside contractor at what the Committee believes was a substantial cost savings. Last year, it recompeted this contract and signed a new, 7-year contract. However, the FAA is only utilizing the contract at about 40 percent of its authorized ceiling. The Committee believes that the FAA should make maximum use of the contract in order to provide proficiency training for its current controller work force and to expedite training of new controllers. The Committee does not support bringing this training in-house. Controllers, especially highly qualified senior ones, are needed for the safe and efficient operation of the ATC system. Removing them from operating duties for long periods of time to conduct training or other staff work is an inefficient use of their time and expertise. This approach is also an unwise use of scarce resources when a more cost-effective method is available.

New York Air Route Traffic Control Center outages.—This past June, the FAA released a preliminary report regarding three power outages which occurred at the New York Air Traffic Control Center between April 6 and May 25, 1995. The Committee encourages the FAA to aggressively pursue solutions to problems that were discovered as a result of the examination. The Committee believes that the FAA's examination should not only focus on the causes of past power outages, but should also identify and address potential problems that could cause future outages. In addition, the FAA should apply the information gained during this investigation to other control centers throughout the air traffic control system, in order to prevent similar outages from occurring in other parts of the country.

Wind shear protection for New York City's airports.—In order to resolve longstanding problems regarding siting of terminal doppler weather radars serving Kennedy International Airport and LaGuardia Airport, the conference report on the fiscal year 1995 Transportation appropriations bill directed the FAA to site a terminal doppler weather radar [TDWR] at an appropriate location and to install a low-level wind shear alert system [LLWAS] at LaGuardia Airport. The conferees also had approved FAA's decision not to site the radar at either North Bellmore or Roslyn, NY.

The Committee is extremely concerned that the FAA has made no progress on siting either the TDWR or the LLWAS. Therefore, in order to enhance aviation safety in the New York metro area, the Committee directs the FAA to complete the site selection process and to begin any environmental review process that may be required for the TDWR installation, and to install the LLWAS at LaGuardia Airport. The Committee expects the FAA to provide monthly progress reports on its actions to follow these directions.

Ogden-Hinckley Municipal Airport.—Ogden-Hinckley serves as the primary reliever to Salt Lake International Airport. Ogden-Hinckley does not have the security capability to handle passengers from these diverts. The needed capability to handle diverts is further heightened by the expected air travel needs associated with the 2000 Winter Olympics.

The Committee, in the Senate report accompanying the fiscal year 1993 Transportation appropriations bill, directed the FAA to give priority consideration to the grant requests for upgrade or replacement of terminal facilities at Ogden-Hinckley Municipal Airport. Subsequent to passage of the bill, the FAA opined that it had no authority, despite this Committee's direction, to allocate funds to Ogden-Hinckley because of its status as a reliever.

The FAA has now recognized that Ogden-Hinckley, as a reliever, is eligible to receive terminal improvement funds. In order to reinstate the priority status given by this Committee in the 102d Congress to Ogden-Hinckley's grant application, the Committee again directs the FAA to give priority consideration to the grant requests for upgrade or replacement of terminal facilities to meet Federal security, Americans with Disabilities Act, seismic and other requirements.

FAA valuation of airport land donated for AIP grants.—The Committee directs the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to reevaluate the agency's method of valuing privately owned reliever airport land that's donated to the local match of an Airport Improvement Program grant. FAA's guidance should provide for current market value for airport land (privately sponsored) that is donated to meet the airport's local match for an AIP grant. FAA presently allows land donations to attain the local AIP match, but the land is valued at date-of-acquisition value.

The Committee expects that this revision would mandate FAA compliance with Office of Management and Budget regulations governing Federal grant programs. The text addressing matching of Federal funds allows market value for donated land (49 CFR 18.24(f)).

This change in FAA's land valuation method would also conform to the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994 conference report language (Report 103–677), which requested FAA to reconsider its date-of-acquisition valuation of donated land in view of the inequity of date-of-acquisition valued land imposed on privately owned, public-use airports.

Current market value land valuations should be allowed only for land donated to attain the private airport sponsor's local matching share of an AIP grant. Date-of-acquisition valuation for land will continue for FAA reimbursement of the cost of previously acquired land.

Airport preservation.—The Committee directs the Federal Aviation Administration to give priority consideration to the preservation of public use, general aviation, and reliever airports in those States whose general aviation and reliever airports are threatened with closure, and where such closures would significantly add to the extensive delays already encountered at major hubs serving those States.

Significant emphasis should be placed on those States whose critical reliever airports and general aviation airports are predominantly privately owned public use facilities, which are threatened with closure but are under consideration for preservation through public ownership.

Princeton Airport.—The Committee is aware of ongoing concerns regarding the routing of flights over the residential areas near

Princeton Airport, NJ. Princeton Airport is now in the process of developing a master plan and airport layout plan [ALP], which must be approved by the FAA as well as by the State.

In order to encourage prompt resolution of the issues at Princeton Airport, the Committee directs the FAA to (1) withhold release of any additional AIP funds to the Princeton Airport for any airport development project; and (2) to negotiate with the State of New Jersey to amend the State Block Grant Pilot Program Agreement of July 10, 1993, and the State Block Grant Agreement of July 19, 1993, to provide for withholding the release of any State Block Grant Pilot Program funds to Princeton Airport for any airport development project, until the current environmental assessment and the master plan/ALP have been completed and evaluated with full public input and comment; and, until the Secretary is satisfied and reports to the Committee that fair consideration has been given to the interests of the communities affected by Princeton Airport, as required by section 509(b)(4) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 for direct AIP grants; and, that any proposed project in Princeton Airport's master plan is consistent with adopted master plans of communities affected by the airport.

Similar language was included in last year's report. The Committee is pleased to learn that progress on this issue has been made. The Committee encourages parties associated with this dispute to continue their negotiations so that a final solution to this problem can be reached.

Flood-damaged Missouri airports.—It is the Committee's understanding that the FAA assured the State of Missouri funds for 1993 flood-damaged airports. In addition, it is the Committee's understanding that the State has provided the necessary documentation requested by the FAA, including damage reports and estimates of repairs. At this time, the FAA has not fulfilled its commitment. Therefore, the Committee directs the FAA to fulfill its commitment to the State by providing $2,100,000 from existing funds to finish the flood repair projects to ensure that the air transportation system remains safe, efficient, and available for public use.

Maryland air noise.—The Committee directs the Federal Aviation Administration to enforce all applicable rules and regulations governing noise abatement procedures at Washington National Airport and closely monitor aircraft noise in Montgomery County, MD. The Committee also directs the FAA to work with the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority to continue efforts aimed at reducing aircraft noise in Montgomery County.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL CORPORATION

The Committee for years has been frustrated by delays and cost overruns by the FAA in its capital improvement programs. The Committee also has expressed repeatedly its concerns over the FAA's ability to adequately staff air traffic control facilities, particularly in the wake of the PATCO strike. Accordingly, the Committee commends Vice President Gore and his National Performance Review effort and Secretary Peña for his efforts to address these and other issues facing the FAA and the air traffic control [ATC] system.

It should be noted that the Department has taken several significant steps to better manage programs that have been plagued by delays and overruns, including the advanced automation system [AAS]. The Committee commends these efforts. However, it also recognizes that many of the problems with programs such as the AAS result in large part from the interrelated issues—procurement, personnel, and budget—identified by the administration in its ATC reform proposal; and, further, that the long-term success of the administration's changes are affected by these same issues. The Committee is also aware that the FAA has undertaken some two dozen internal reorganizations in the last decade without being able to successfully address the underlying problems that have plagued the ATC system.

It is clearly the top priority of the air traffic control system to ensure the safety of all those using the Nation's airspace. In order to ensure that the outstanding safety record of U.S. aviation continues, it is essential that new technologies be brought on line more quickly and cost effectively than has been the case under current FAA procedures. In its May 1994 Air Traffic Control Corporation study, the administration provided extensive summaries of the problems contributing to the inefficiencies of the ATC system and discussed a range of options for addressing those problems, both within the existing FAA and through the proposed creation of the U.S. Air Traffic Services Corporation [USATS].

This proposal is of significant interest to this Committee for two principal reasons. First, the proposal attempts to address problems identified and focused on by this Committee. Second, any proposal to significantly alter the structure and the function of the FAA would have direct impacts on programs funded through the Committee, and on the appropriations process more generally. The Committee intends to continue working with the administration in efforts to bring meaningful reform to the air traffic control system.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

FAA technical center.—The Committee has a general provision naming the Federal Aviation Administration technical center located at Atlantic City International Airport in Pomona, NJ, as the William J. Hughes Technical Center. Congressman Hughes served the citizens of the Second District of New Jersey for 20 years. During his tenure in Congress his statesmanship won him the admiration of all of his colleagues. The Committee believes the naming of the technical center in the congressional district he once served would be a fitting tribute and sign of appreciation to a man of Congressman Hughes' stature.

O'Hare Airport slot management.—The Committee agrees with the House bill language contained in section 323 which would prohibit the Department of Transportation from withdrawing domestic slots at Chicago's O'Hare Airport and replacing them with slots for international carriers. Statutory provisions such as this would normally limit the Department's flexibility in managing the bilateral negotiation process with other countries and could reduce the U.S. ability to obtain access for domestic carriers to foreign markets. However, since slots are usually reallocated before the start of the

winter season, the Committee believes the Department has adequate time to manage the slots at O'Hare.

Collective bargaining for international flightcrews of U.S. carriers.—The Committee has included a general provision which seeks to protect the public interest in uninterrupted international air service and the stability of collective bargaining relationships between U.S. air carriers and their flightcrew employees (flight deck crewmembers and flight cabin crewmembers). This is done by confirming that the Railway Labor Act applies to U.S. air carriers and their flightcrew employees while operating to, from, or between points outside the United States.

The proposed amendment preserves the act's preference for systemwide collective bargaining agreements and permits such agreements to be enforced in the statutory adjustment board in accordance with the parties' intent. The amendment also prevents either a U.S. air carrier or a flightcrew labor organization from evading its obligations under the act by simply relying on the geographical location of a particular operation or event within the system.

Passenger facility charge increase.—The proposed change to section 40117(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, will permit an airport to increase the passenger facility fee it has the authority to impose pursuant to its approved application by no more than $2, and in such a manner as prescribed in regulations, for the purpose of financing an eligible airport-related project. The proposed change also allows an airport to make an annual adjustment to the amount of its approved fee, and any adjustment to that fee of no more than $2, by the Consumer Price Index for each respective year to finance any increase in the costs of constructing an eligible airport-related project.

Passenger facility charge termination.—The objectives behind creating passenger facility fees were to enhance airport capacity and to increase investment in airport infrastructure. One of the primary goals of the program was to allow passenger facility revenues to leverage long-term financing through a predictable flow of funds. However, the Secretary's ability to terminate any part of the agency's authority to impose a passenger facility fee because the agency used such fees to finance a project not covered within the meaning of section 40117 has severely limited the ability to attract investment capital.

The passenger facility fee termination provision is viewed by the investment community as empowering the Secretary to terminate the agency's authority to impose a passenger facility fee unilaterally, with little warning, and without protecting airport bond investors. Consequently, no passenger facility fee bonds have been issued with an investment grade rating by Moody's or Standard & Poor's.

The proposed change to Section 40117(h)(2) would prevent termination of passenger facility revenues pledged to pay debt service where the proceeds of bonds sold were used to construct eligible airport-related projects.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	$2,087,489,000
Rescission	(35,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	1,917,847,000
House allowance	2,000,000,000
Rescission	(60,000,000)
Committee recommendation	1,890,377,000
Rescission	(70,000,000)

Under the ''Facilities and equipment'' appropriation, safety, capacity and efficiency of the Federal airway system are improved by the procurement and installation of new equipment and the construction and modernization of facilities to keep pace with aeronautical activity and in accordance with the Federal Aviation Administration's comprehensive capital investment plan [CIP], formerly called the national airspace system [NAS] plan.

CIP MILESTONES FOR MAJOR SYSTEM ACQUISITIONS

System name	Year of first-site implementation				Year of last-site implementation			
	1983 NAS plan	1991 CIP	1993 CIP	1995 CIP	1983 NAS plan	1991 CIP	1993 CIP	1995 CIP
Advanced automation system [AAS]	1990	1991	1991	([1])	1994	2001	2004	([1])
Display system replacement [DSR]	.....	.....	.....	1998	.....	.....	.....	2000
Standard terminal automation replacement system [STARS]	.....	.....	.....	1998	.....	.....	.....	2003
Tower control computer complex [TCCC]	.....	.....	.....	1997	.....	.....	.....	2000
Air route surveillance radar [ARSR–4]	1988	1993	1994	1995	1991	1996	1996	1997
Airport surface detection equipment [ASDE–3]	1987	1992	1993	1993	1990	1994	1996	1999
Automated weather observing system [AWOS]	1986	1989	1989	1989	1990	1997	1997	1997
Central weather processor [CWP]	1990	1991	1991	1991	1991	1998	[2] 1992	[2] 1993
Flight service automation system [FSAS]	1984	1991	1991	1991	1989	1995	1994	1995
Mode S	1988	1993	1994	1994	1993	1996	1996	1996
Radio microwave link [RML] replacement and expansion	1985	1986	1986	1986	1989	1994	1993	1993
Terminal doppler weather radar [TDWR]	([3])	1993	1994	1994	([3])	1996	1996	[4] 1996
Voice switching and control system [VSCS]	1989	1995	1995	1995	1992	1997	1997	1997

[1] The AAS Program has been restructured into three areas: En route [DSR], terminal [STARS], and tower [TCCC].

[2] Dates denoted are for MWP I only. The CWP-RWP segment has been eliminated as a continuation of the CWP Program, and has been merged with MWP II into the Weather and Radar Processor [WARP] Program.

[3] The TDWR was not included in the 1983 NAS plan.

[4] Schedule under review for last-site implementation.

Source: FAA 1983 NAS plan, 1991, 1993, 1995 CIP.

REASONS FOR DELAY AND COST INCREASES IN CIP PROJECTS

System name	Reasons for delay
Advanced automation system [AAS]	In general, AAS delays were due to an overly ambitious plan, inadequate FAA oversight of the contractor, and ineffective resolution of requirements issues. The AAS Program has been restructured into three areas: En route, terminal, and tower.
Air route surveillance radar [ARSR–4] ..	Problems with the radar's development and site preparation delayed first-site implementation. Testing took longer than originally expected. More recently, delays have occurred due to changes in system design and interface problems with other ATC systems.
Airport surface detection equipment [ASDE–3].	Original delays occurred because FAA and the contractor underestimated software complexity, FAA changed some requirements, and testing uncovered some performance problems. Software development, establishing remote towers, site selection/preparation, and the addition of seven systems have delayed the program.
Automated weather observing system [AWOS].	Site prep, installation, and maintenance problems, as well as delays in receiving Government-furnished equipment contributed to original delays.
Central weather processor [CWP]	Early software development problems and software discrepancies during testing delayed the system in early stages. The program was descoped to just the CWP-MWP I segment, which is now fully implemented.
Flight service automation system [FSAS].	Original delays occurred because of software development and testing problems with the Model I system. Scheduled for completion in 1995.
Mode S	Problems in developing hardware and software during initial phases delayed the system, and software problems caused a delay in first-site implementation.
Radar microwave link [RML] replacement and expansion.	In the early stages, site acquisition and prep problems delayed the system. Other delays occurred because of a change in the prime contractor and due to problems encountered during operational test and evaluation. Program implementation is complete.
Terminal doppler weather radar [TDWR].	Site availability and land acquisition problems have delayed last-site implementation.
Voice switching and control system [VSCS].	Early delays were due to the two prototype contractors having technical difficulties in meeting FAA's requirements for system reliability. Additional delays occurred because of software development and integration problems during the upgrade of the prototype to a production model. The implementation schedule has not changed since the 1991 CIP.

The bill includes an appropriation of $1,890,377,000 for the facilities and equipment of the Federal Aviation Administration. The Committee's recommended distributions of the funds for each of the major accounts are as follows:

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

Projects	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Engineering, development, test, and evaluation:			
En route programs:			
Aviation weather services improvements	$13,700,000	$26,100,000	$13,700,000
En Route Automation Program	317,400,000	256,700,000	256,700,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

Projects	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Aeronautical data link	.....	27,400,000	27,400,000
Oceanic automation system	47,100,000	47,100,000	47,100,000
Voice switching and control system [VSCS]—EDT&E	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Subtotal, en route programs	389,200,000	368,300,000	355,900,000
Terminal programs:			
Airport surveillance radar [ASR]	14,300,000	14,300,000	14,300,000
Remote maintenance monitoring [RMMS]—sustain	3,000,000	3,000,000	.....
Terminal Automation Program	31,600,000	31,600,000	24,400,000
Tower Automation Program	29,500,000	29,500,000	29,500,000
Terminal area surveillance sensor [TASS]	.....	5,800,000	5,000,000
Subtotal, terminal programs	78,400,000	84,200,000	73,200,000
Research, test, and evaluation equipment and facilities:			
Independent operational test and evaluation [IOT&E] sup	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
FAA Technical Center facility—technical building lease	5,290,000	.....	5,290,000
Utility plant modifications	1,560,000	.....	1,560,000
General airport improvement	150,000	.....	150,000
NAS improvement of system support laboratory	2,000,000	.....	2,000,000
Technical Center facilities	9,600,000	20,600,000	9,600,000
Technical Center fiber data distribution interface	2,000,000	.....	2,000,000
CAMI infrastructure—modernization	600,000	600,000	600,000
Cabin research facility construction	500,000	500,000	500,000
Subtotal, research, test, and evaluation equipment and facilities	23,200,000	23,200,000	23,200,000
Total, engineering, development, test, and evaluation	490,800,000	475,700,000	452,300,000
Air traffic control facilities and equipment:			
En route programs:			
Display channel complex rehosts	.....	.....	20,000,000
Long Range Radar [LRR] Program—replace/establish	12,800,000	12,800,000	12,800,000
Radar microwave link [RML] system replacement/expansion	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Next generation weather radar [Nexrad]—provide	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000
Air traffic control en route radar facilities improvements	17,700,000	11,800,000	11,800,000
En Route Automation Program	17,700,000	17,700,000	17,700,000
Air traffic operations management system [ATOMS]	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Weather and radar processor [WARP]	7,800,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
Aeronautical data link [ADL] applications	15,000,000	.....	.....
ARTCC building improvements/plant improvements	42,100,000	59,100,000	59,100,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

Projects	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Voice switching and control system [VSCS]	112,700,000	106,100,000	106,100,000
Remote communication facilities [RCF's]—expand/relocate	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Traffic flow management	28,500,000	40,300,000	34,000,000
Data multiplexing network [DMN]	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
Critical communications support	3,000,000	.....	2,000,000
En route communications and control facilities improvement	3,181,000	3,181,000	3,181,000
Satellite communications circuit backup	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
DOD base closure—facility transfer	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Backup emergency communications [BUUEC]—interim	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Volcano monitor	.....	.....	2,000,000
Subtotal, en route programs	293,181,000	291,481,000	309,180,000
Terminal programs:			
Terminal doppler weather radar [TDWR]—provide	4,900,000	47,400,000	7,400,000
Mode S—provide	12,700,000	12,700,000	12,700,000
Terminal Automation Program	22,800,000	17,300,000	17,300,000
Airport movement area safety system [AMASS]	11,300,000	31,300,000	.....
Remote maintenance monitoring system [RMMS]—provide	27,500,000	15,000,000	24,500,000
Terminal air traffic control facilities—replace	60,400,000	60,400,000	60,400,000
Air traffic control tower [ATCT]/TRACON facilites—improve	25,664,000	22,800,000	25,600,000
Metroplex control facility—advanced facility planning	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Emergency transceivers—replacement	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Terminal voice switch replacement [TVSR]	7,000,000	14,000,000	7,000,000
Radio control equipment [RCE]—provide	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
Terminal radar [ASR]—improve	3,506,000	3,506,000	2,700,000
Airport surface detection equipment [ASDE]—additional establishment	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000
Low-cost ASDE	.....	8,000,000	.....
Loop technology (surface detection)	.....	2,000,000	.....
Potomac project metroplex	12,600,000	12,600,000	10,400,000
Northern California metroplex	.....	10,000,000	2,000,000
Atlanta metroplex	.....	10,000,000	3,800,000
Employee safety/OSHA and environmental compliance standards	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
ARTS IIIA data entry/display	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Chicago metroplex—limited consolidation	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex program	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
Precision runway monitors	1,200,000	1,200,000	.....
New Austin Airport at Bergstrom	14,800,000	14,800,000	12,000,000
Southern California metroplex	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Integrated network management system	300,000	.....	.....
Terminal communications improvements	3,495,000	3,495,000	3,495,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

Projects	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, terminal programs	262,065,000	340,401,000	243,195,000
Flight service programs:			
Flight service station [FSS] modernization	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Automated surface observing system [ASOS]	24,500,000	24,500,000	24,500,000
FSAS operational and supportability implementation system [OASIS]	18,700,000	18,700,000	16,700,000
Flight service facilities improvement	805,000	805,000	805,000
Subtotal, flight services	45,005,000	45,005,000	43,005,000
Landing and Navigational Aids Program:			
VOR/DME/TACAN network plan	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Instrument landing system [ILS]—replace (Mark 1A, 1B, and 1C)	6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
Instrument landing system [ILS]—establish/upgrade	30,000,000	33,500,000	35,000,000
Visual navaids—establish/expand	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Low level windshear alert system [LLWAS]—upgrade to phase III	1,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Runway visual range [RVR]	2,000,000	9,000,000	2,000,000
Instrument approach procedures automation [IAPA]	900,000	900,000	900,000
Gulf of Mexico Offshore Program	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
Instrument landing system [ILS]—replace GRN 27	6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
Wide area augmentation system for GPS	86,900,000	86,900,000	86,900,000
Navigational and landing aids—improve	3,864,000	3,864,000	3,864,000
Subtotal, landing and navigational aids	146,364,000	170,864,000	165,364,000
Other ATC facilities programs:			
Alaskan NAS interfacility communications system [ANICS]	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
Fuel storage tank replacement and monitoring	25,000,000	9,400,000	23,800,000
FAA buildings and equipment—improve/modernize	7,232,000	7,232,000	7,232,000
Electrical power systems—sustain/support	5,400,000	5,400,000	5,400,000
Air navigational aids and air traffic control facilities (local projects)	2,500,000	.....	1,000,000
Air navigational facilities/air traffic control system support—provide	4,500,000	.....	2,500,000
Purchase land or easement for existing facilities	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Aircraft and Related Equipment Program	4,900,000	4,900,000	3,900,000
Aircraft fleet modernization	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000
Airport cable loop systems—sustained support	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Computer-aided engineering graphics [CAEG] replacement	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Subtotal, other ATC facility programs	115,432,000	92,832,000	109,732,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

Projects	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Total, air traffic control facilities and equipment	862,047,000	940,583,000	870,477,000
Non-air traffic control facilities and equipment:			
Support equipment:			
NAS Management Automation Program [NASMAP]	2,000,000	.....	1,500,000
Hazardous materials management	22,100,000	21,000,000	22,100,000
National airspace system recovery communications [RCOM]	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Aviation safety analysis system [ASAS]	19,400,000	19,400,000	19,400,000
Operational data management system [ODMS]	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
Child care facilities	2,600,000	5,200,000	2,600,000
FAA employee housing—provide	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
Logistics support systems and facilities	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Test equipment—maintenance support for replacement	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Integrated flight quality assurance	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Safety performance analysis system [SPAS]	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Portable performance support system pen-based technology	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
National Aviation Safety Data Center [ASAAP]	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Aviation security	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotal, support equipment	79,200,000	78,700,000	78,700,000
Training, equipment, and facilities:			
Computer-based instruction/distance learning	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000
Aeronautical center training and support facilities	6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
National airspace system [NAS] training facilities	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, training, equipment, and facilities	18,700,000	18,700,000	18,700,000
Total, non-air traffic control facilities and equipment	97,900,000	97,400,000	92,400,000
Mission support:			
System support and services:			
System engineering and technical assistance [SETA]	72,400,000	72,400,000	69,400,000
Program support leases	27,000,000	31,117,000	27,000,000
Logistics support services	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Mike Monroney Aeronautical Center—lease	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
In-plant national airspace system [NAS] contract support services	4,900,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
Transition engineering support	50,000,000	60,000,000	50,000,000
Frequency and spectrum engineering—provide	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT—Continued

Projects	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Acquisition oversight	400,000	400,000	400,000
FAA system architecture	4,900,000	2,000,000	4,000,000
Technical services support contract [TSSC]	62,200,000	61,200,000	60,200,000
Permanent change of station [PCS]	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Total, mission support	260,100,000	270,317,000	254,200,000
Personnel and related expenses	207,000,000	216,000,000	216,000,000
Total, all activities	1,917,847,000	2,000,000,000	1,890,377,000

ENGINEERING, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

The Committee recommends $359,900,000 for various engineering, development, test, and evaluation activities.

Advanced automation system [AAS].—The advanced automation system's purpose is to modernize essential outdated components of the air traffic control system so that they are more reliable and efficient, are able to handle more air traffic with fewer delays, and will enable airlines to realize savings in fuel and crew costs. The AAS includes real time data processing software and computers, and new air traffic control consoles which will be installed in FAA en route centers, terminal facilities, and towers.

In response to the Committee's longstanding concerns of cost growth and schedule delays, a major restructuring of the AAS Program was completed in 1995. This restructuring included both technical and management changes resulting in an estimated savings of nearly $1,600,000,000. From the technical standpoint, program risk has been reduced, software coding practices have been improved, and a greater emphasis has been placed on off-the-shelf hardware and software. FAA management of AAS has been separated into three product areas: (1) en route automation, (2) terminal automation, and (3) tower automation. These product areas are to improve FAA program management through increased accountability of these areas.

En route automation includes the display system replacement [DSR] as a cost-effective modification to the initial sector suite system [ISSS]; display channel complex rehost [DCCR], a low-risk contingency system; advanced en route automation [AERA], enhancements providing direct benefits to airway users; en route software development support [ERSDS], maintains software in existing system; en route automation equipment, maintains existing hardware; flight data input/output [FDIO]; and en route stand alone radar training system [ESARTS].

An independent study by the Carnegie-Mellon Software Executive Institute found the ISSS/DSR software architecture to be sound. A follow-on, in-depth, FAA study concluded the software carried over from ISSS to DSR was acceptable. The DSR will continue under the modified contract with Loral who completed the purchase of IBM Federal Systems in 1995. Other system procurements are separate efforts and will be accomplished under existing

contracts or competitively awarded contracts. To carry out the necessary modernization efforts in the en route automation segment, the Committee recommends fiscal year 1996 funding of $256,700,000 under budget line item engineering, development, test, and evaluation, and $17,700,000 under budget line item procurement and modernization for en route programs.

Terminal automation includes the standard terminal automation replacement system [STARS], a cost-effective alternative to the canceled terminal advanced automation system [TAAS]; automated radar terminal system [ARTS] IIIE, interim system for large facilities, digital bright radar indicator tower equipment [DBRITE], display equipment for tower air traffic controllers; terminal software development [TSD], interim software maintenance to existing system.

The STARS will be competitively procured based on minimal enhancements to existing off-the-shelf systems. For terminal automation modernization, the Committee recommends fiscal 1996 funding of $24,400,000 under budget line item engineering, development, test, and evaluation, and $17,300,000 under budget line item procurement and modernization for terminal programs.

Tower automation includes the tower control computer complex [TCCC], which upgrades tower computers and displays, will continue under a separate contract agreement with Loral. The Committee recommends fiscal year 1996 funding of $29,500,000 under budget line item engineering, development, test, and evaluation to complete development and test, and install TCCC at one key site. Additional systems are planned for approximately 70 of the FAA's busiest towers.

Aviation weather services.—The Committee has provided the full amount requested by the administration for aviation weather services, $13,700,000. This funding level would reduce the House allowance by $12,400,000. The Committee does not believe that the aviation weather services program as described should be funded within the ''Facilities and equipment'' account, and the resources provided would be best spent in the ''Aviation weather research'' account within research and development.

Aeronautical data link.—The Committee has provided $27,400,000 under the en route engineering, development, test, and evaluation program. The Committee agrees with the House that increased funding is necessary for this program, to accelerate implementation of the data link infrastructure.

Voice switching and control system [VSCS].—The Committee concurs with the House recommendation to provide $11,000,000 for further engineering, development, test, and evaluation of the Voice Switching and Control System. Funding is provided under this particular budget activity rather than the procurement subcategory, to more accurately reflect the nature of the work being performed.

PROCUREMENT AND MODERNIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

EN ROUTE PROGRAMS

The Committee's recommendation is for $165,364,000.

Display channel complex rehosts.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 above the administration's request for the display channel complex rehost. The Committee feels that this is the best short-term remedy for the aging computers that are now at busy air traffic control centers. It was obvious with the recent outages at the Chicago center that speedy replacement of the display channel complex at the centers is necessary.

The Committee believes that, until air traffic control's modernization efforts come to fruition, this funding, if properly used, would provide some insurance against further problems that place the entire air route control system in jeopardy.

The Committee believes that FAA needs to implement the display channel complex replacement or rehosting program as soon as possible, and that a solution to the 1970's vintage, IBM 9020E computer is necessary. The Committee believes that rehosting may be necessary until the successor to this equipment, the display channel complex replacement which is now only being prototyped at the FAA technical center, is operational.

The Committee further believes that attention should immediately be paid to the five IBM 9020E sites, which are Chicago, Cleveland, Washington, New York, and Dallas/Fort Worth. The Committee directs that funds available after the rehosting of these centers be used at the remaining 17 FAA centers. If necessary, the FAA can use some of these funds for necessary administrative costs of its airways system specialists.

Traffic control en route facilities improvements.—The Committee has reduced the en route radar facilities improvements request to the House level of $11,800,000 due to what it considers inadequate justification for the total funding requested.

Air route traffic control center [ARTCC] improvement/plant modernization/space expansion.—FAA is requesting $42,100,000 to perform needed modernization and expansion at its ARTCC's to accommodate new equipment that will comprise the advanced automation system. The Committee has provided $59,100,000, which was also included by the House. This is a $17,000,000 increase over the original budget request. The Committee believes that this increase is necessary for display system replacement [DSR].

Voice switching and control systems [VSCS].—The House has reduced funding under procurement and modernization for VSCS by $6,600,000. The Committee agrees with the House recommendation to provide funding of $106,100,000 for VSCS. The Committee believes that this reduction to engineering support for maintenance, program management, airway facilities training, and technical services can be accommodated within the existing schedule for fiscal year 1996.

Traffic flow management.—The Committee has provided $5,500,000 above the administration's request for the traffic flow management program. At this funding level, however, it is still $5,700,000 below the House allowance. The Committee does agree with the general thrust of the House approach, which was to provide additional funding to accelerate the center/TRACON automation system. The Committee also expects that the additional funding provided would be for the terminal air traffic control automation program [TATCA].

Critical telecommunications support.—The Committee has reduced funding under the activity by $1,000,000 due to budget constraints.

Volcano monitor.—The Committee has included funding for the Alaska Volcano Observatory to place seismological equipment and data transmission facilities on suspect volcanoes across the Alaska peninsula and the Aleutian Islands.

TERMINAL PROGRAMS

Terminal doppler weather radar [TDWR].—The Committee has included $2,500,000 above the budget request for the TDWR program. It expects that this increased funding would be used for the installation of the TDWR at Las Vegas, and the environmental impact statement process in New York. The House had included funding for an additional five new TDWR's. However, the FAA has appealed this on the basis that the more cost-effective way to meet future windshear requirements is through the ASR/windshear alert program.

Terminal automation.—The Committee has reduced the requested level for the terminal automation program to $17,300,000. The Committee has reduced funding for this program because of the unobligated balance of $7,000,000 that FAA is holding out for potential problems arising in developing and fielding new software. However, based on information, the software would not be fielded until 1997 at the earliest.

Airport movement area safety system [AMASS].—The House has included $20,000,000 above the administration's request for the airport movement area safety system [AMASS]. Airport movement area safety system is designed to provide audio and visual alerts for controllers who are using the airport surface detection equipment [ASDE–3). This system is expected to help alleviate false target problems experienced at some sites that are using the ASDE–3 equipment. As of fiscal year 1995, the agency has received approximately $26,000,000 for the AMASS system, and is requesting an additional $11,300,000 in fiscal year 1996 for production and installation of AMASS at 11 of 40 sites.

The fiscal year 1996 request would cover the procurement of an additional 11 AMASS units, but it is unclear to the Committee what the obligation plans are for those funds. It is the Committee's understanding that the current schedule does not plan for ordering full production of the AMASS systems until May 1997, and, therefore, the unobligated balances that currently exist should be sufficient to allow the agency to order three full-scale development and seven low-rate initial production units [LRIP] systems.

The House has provided $31,300,000 for the AMASS system. The Committee supports the program, but believes that because of schedule delays and slippages, additional funding is not warranted at this time.

Remote maintenance monitoring [RMMS].—The Committee has reduced the requested level for remote maintenance monitoring by $3,000,000. This reduction was due to budget constraints. The Committee has provided $9,500,000 above the House level, and expects that the restored funding will provide improvements to software and hardware systems that will be the basis for the open sys-

tem architecture in order to better facilitate centralized maintenance.

Terminal voice switch replacement [TVSR].—The Committee has reduced the House allowance by $7,000,000, restoring this line item to the original fiscal year 1996 budget request of $7,000,000. The Committee has no evidence that, with the increased funding for the terminal voice switch replacement project, this funding could be obligated in fiscal year 1996, though it does support the House's emphasis to support the enhanced TVSR procurement.

Terminal radar [ASR]—improve.—The Committee has slightly reduced the request for the terminal radar improvement program (−$800,000). The Committee has reduced funding for the contingency funding which was requested by FAA, and has also cut the fiscal year 1996 request based on funding available through previous projects coming in significantly under budget. The Committee feels there are sufficient unobligated balances in this account to handle correction of site-specific problems or deficiencies that typically arise during the course of the year.

Below-cost ASDE.—The Committee has eliminated funding provided by the House for the below-cost ASDE program. No funding was requested under the "Facilities and equipment" account by the administration. The Committee believes that FAA can and should use research, engineering, and development funding to explore low-cost surface detection technology alternatives, but has not provided funding in this account, which is used for procurement.

Loop technology (surface detection).—The Committee has not included the $2,000,000 which was provided by the House for loop technology surface detection. FAA has appealed to the Committee that the sponsored demonstration program of this technology determined that loop technology is not as effective as other technologies for airport surface detection.

Potomac Metroplex.—The Committee has reduced the requested funding for the Potomac Metroplex by $2,200,000, because it believes that actual land costs should and could be lower than originally planned by the Federal Aviation Administration. The Committee was briefed that FAA will do all that is possible to find a low-cost or a no-cost site, and, therefore, the Committee believes the $6,000,000 budgeted for land purchase is extremely high. The $6,000,000 figure was estimated on the need for a 20-acre site costing $300,000 per acre. Other TRACON's across the country are housed on much less land than the 20 acres budgeted by FAA.

Northern California Metroplex.—The House has included $10,000,000 above the budget request for the northern California Metroplex. The Committee supports the need for expediting site selection and engineering work in the northern California area for the metroplex, and has provided $2,000,000 for that purpose.

Atlanta Metroplex.—The House has included $10,000,000 for an Atlanta Metroplex, funding which was not requested by the administration. The Committee supports expeditious creation of an Atlanta Metroplex, and has included $3,800,000 for land acquisition, environmental impact statements, and preliminary engineering work, but believes that remaining funding can be deferred until fiscal year 1997.

Precision runway monitors.—The House has included $1,200,000 for the precision runway monitor program. For fiscal year 1996, the administration requested $1,200,000 for engineering and program support for the installation of procured systems. This program has an unobligated balance of approximately $30,000,000. To date, FAA has installed only one precision runway monitor, and delay in the validation of additional sites makes it unlikely that additional systems will be purchased or installed in fiscal year 1995. Consequently, the unobligated prior-year funds should be sufficient to cover any 1996 engineering and program support needs.

New Austin Airport.—The Committee has reduced the requested funding for the new Austin Airport by $2,800,000. The Committee has reduced funding by one-half, which was originally estimated for the cable-loop system. It does not appear that FAA will obligate any of the $18,500,000 received in fiscal year 1995 for the new Austin Airport until August of this year. If other alternatives are selected for a combined tower TRACON at the airport, it would push out the project's schedule even further, and possibly reduce FAA's funding needs because of the need to replan the project. Also, FAA is in discussion with the city of Austin for cost sharing some of the project's costs. Therefore, the Committee feels that the funding cut will not impair nor slow down implementation of this project, which the Committee supports.

FLIGHT SERVICE PROGRAMS

Automated surface observing system [ASOS].—The Committee has provided $24,500,000 for ASOS, which is the same as the House level and the administration's request. The Committee is aware of a recent report regarding technical problems in commissioning ASOS sites. The Committee understands there are off-the-shelf solutions to these problems but implementation of these have been slow. Therefore, the Committee directs the FAA to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than November 1995, regarding the intended solutions to the technical and installation problems associated with this program and the timeline for which it will be implemented.

Flight service automation system [OASIS].—OASIS is designed to provide a life-cycle replacement and upgrade of the current flight service automation system. It appears as though the contract award for the OASIS is scheduled for June 1996. The funds budgeted for the OASIS system will be needed barring any further delays in issuing requests for proposal. However, four OASIS minimum configuration units which were to be initially acquired for the training academy could be eliminated and, therefore, about $2,000,000 of the original request could be reduced.

LANDING AND NAVIGATIONAL AIDS PROGRAM

Instrument landing system [ILS] establish/upgrade.—As part of its report accompanying the Transportation Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995, the Committee directed the FAA to deploy an ILS at Newark International Airport on runway 22Right. In the past, the Committee has been frustrated by the extensive delays that plagued the installation of ILS systems at Newark. The Committee

encourages the FAA to work aggressively to install the ILS on runway 22Right so that its benefits to safety and efficiency can be realized as soon as possible. The Committee has included $4,500,000 for a CAT II/III ILS at Lanai Airport, HA.

Low-level windshear alert system [LLWAS].—The Committee agrees with the House's allowance of $15,000,000 for the low-level windshear alert system. This is $14,000,000 above the original fiscal year 1996 request. The Committee believes that this increase can be used for systems that detect dangerous windshear conditions, and funds could also be used to restore existing LLWAS-II's to original performance standards and provide for new supportable and maintainable equipment.

Runway visual range.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the runway visual range program, which was the fiscal year 1996 budget request. Under existing budget constraints, the Committee believes that the scarce resources could be allocated to higher priority programs.

OTHER ATC FACILITIES PROGRAMS

Fuel storage tank replacement.—The House allowance would cut the fuel storage tank replacement and monitoring program from the requested level of $25,000,000 to $9,400,000. The Committee has restored most of the House's reduction by providing $23,800,000. The restored funding is essential, and is required to comply with Federal and State laws which require the removal of fuel storage tanks by the end of December 1998. Funding for this program is necessary to be in place to address the multitude of tanks and sites that need removal and replacement to meet environmental laws.

ATC facilities (local projects).—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the air traffic control facilities local projects. This restored funding would be used to achieve more effective and cost-efficient management. The funding provided by the Committee is expected to allow regions to respond to various types of emergencies that arise during the year which involve air traffic control facilities, and is needed for timely response by FAA to correct site-specific emergencies.

Air navigation facilities—provide.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the air navigation facilities support and provide line item. The restored funding will provide for critical air traffic control facility implementation efforts, which the Committee expects would be directly related to safety improvements of the air traffic control system. It can also be used as a fund to enable the resolution of unforeseen project problems.

Aircraft and related equipment.—The Committee has reduced the ''Aircraft and related equipment'' account $1,000,000 below the requested level. Funding was requested to upgrade avionics and flight inspection systems used in FAA-owned aircraft, and to procure and enhance other systems used in scheduling and monitoring the aircraft. Based on budget reports from FAA, there appears to be a significant amount of unobligated balances that were provided in prior years. The funding earmarked for the aircraft-800 avionics upgrade project appears to be $1,000,000 more than current esti-

mates for the upgrade. Therefore, the Committee has reduced the fiscal year 1996 request by that amount.

MAJOR EQUIPMENT ACTIVITY

TERMINAL DOPPLER WEATHER RADAR

City	Delivery dates	Commissioning dates
Oklahoma City—FAA Academy	Dec. 9, 1991[1]	NA
Memphis	June 2, 1992[1]	Dec. 13, 1994.
Houston Intercontinental	Oct. 2, 1992[1]	July 21, 1994.
Atlanta	Jan. 13, 1993[1]	August 1995.
Washington National	July 8, 1993[1]	July 1995.
Denver	July 6, 1993[1]	Do.
Chicago O'Hare	Sept. 17, 1993[1]	September 1995.
St. Louis	Jan. 3, 1994[1]	Feb. 1, 1995.
Orlando	Mar. 17, 1994[1]	December 1995.[2]
New Orleans	Apr. 2, 1994[1]	September 1995.[2]
Tampa	May 16, 1994[1]	October 1995.
Miami	June 6, 1994	November 1995.[2]
Pittsburgh	July 10, 1994[1]	September 1995.
Andrews	Aug. 13, 1994[1]	Do.
Newark	...do	Do.
Boston	Aug. 29, 1994[1]	August 1995.
Kansas City	Oct. 2, 1994[1]	July 1995.
Detroit	Oct. 15, 1994	September 1995.[2]
Houston Hobby	Apr. 8, 1995	October 1995.[2]
Dallas Love	Nov. 1, 1994[1]	August 1995.[2]
Oklahoma City—PSF facility	Dec. 14, 1994	NA
Dallas/Fort Worth	Jan. 30, 1995	October 1995.[2]
Dayton	Dec. 19, 1994[1]	November 1995.
Wichita	Feb. 6, 1995	November 1995.[2]
Indianapolis	Mar. 5, 1995	January 1995.[2]
Cincinnati	December 1995	September 1996.[2]
Philadelphia	July 1995	March 1996.[2]
Phoenix	September 1995	July 1996.[2]
Milwaukee	May 12, 1995	February 1996.[2]
Chicago Midway	To be determined[3]	To be determined.[3]
Cleveland	August 1995	May 1996.[2]
Columbus	November 1995	August 1996.[2]
San Juan	To be determined[3]	To be determined.[3]
West Palm Beach	June 1995	March 1996.[2]
Nashville	March 1996	December 1996.[2]
Louisville	June 1996	March 1997.[2]
Washington Dulles	October 1995	July 1996.[2]
Charlotte	August 1995	December 1995.[2]
Salt Lake City	November 1995	August 1996.[2]
Fort Lauderdale	To be determined[3]	To be determined.[3]
Baltimore	January 1996	October 1995.[2]
Raleigh/Durham	April 1996	January 1997.[2]
Minneapolis	February 1996	November 1996.[2]
Oklahoma City	January 1996	October 1996.[2]
Tulsa	May 1996	February 1997.[2]
New York City (JFK and LGA)[4]	To be determined[3]	To be determined.[3]
Las Vegas[4]	To be determined[3]	To be determined.[3]

[1] FAA has completed contract inspection and acceptance of equipment.

[2] Date indicated is for planning purposes only, subject to change; commissioning date to be established after FAA actually accepts equipment.

[3] These locations are not yet scheduled for implementation due to delays encountered in resolving environmental issues and public opposition, and in acquiring land.

[4] The radar for New York City will serve both JFK and LGA airports; the radar planned for LGA is relocated in Las Vegas.

NA: Not available.

AIRPORT SURFACE DETECTION EQUIPMENT [ASDE–3]

Site location	Delivery date	Commissioning date
FAA Academy [1]	NA	NA
FAA Technical Center [2]	NA	NA
Pittsburgh, PA	December 1989	May 1995.
San Francisco	November 1991	June 1995.
Dallas/Fort Worth	February 1992	March 1995.
Philadelphia	February 1992	May 1995.
Los Angeles [3]	August 1992	April 1995.
Detroit	August 1992	December 1994.
Cleveland	August 1992	December 1994.
Boston	August 1992	March 1995.
Portland	August 1992	December 1994.
Atlanta	September 1992.	January 1995.
Seattle	September 1992	December 1993.
Los Angeles [3]	February 1993	February 1995.
Denver (DIA) [3 4]	March 1993	April 1995.
St. Louis	December 1993	February 1995.
Denver (DIA)	December 1993	May 1995.
New York-Kennedy	January 1994	February 1995.
Minneapolis	July 1994	March 1995.
Anchorage	August 1994	June 1995.
New Orleans	October 1994	June 1995.
Baltimore	November 1994	May 1995.
Kansas City	December 1994	May 1995.
Miami	February 1995	July 1995.
Houston [3]	February 1995	July 1995.
Memphis	June 1995	November 1995.
Chicago	July 1995	December 1995.
Houston [3]	September 1995	February 1996.
Charlotte [5]	October 1995	March 1996.
Raleigh-Durham	December 1995	May 1996.
Washington National	January 1996	June 1996.
Cincinnati [5]	March 1996	August 1996.
Dulles [5]	April 1996	September 1996.
San Diego [5]	June 1996	November 1996.
Orlando [5]	September 1996	February 1997.
Andrews AFB	March 1997	August 1997.
Orange County	April 1999	September 1999.
Tampa	June 1999	November 1999.
New York-LaGuardia	August 1999	December 1999.
Newark	October 1999	March 2000.

[1] FAA training/field support/depot support facility.
[2] FAA R&D system for runway incursion.
[3] Dual sensor facilities.
[4] Second system was procured in fiscal year 1993.
[5] Fiscal year 1993 congressionally mandated sites.

Instrument landing systems—establish

Location	*Runway*
Equipment:	
Category III:	
Atlanta, GA	27L
St. Louis, MO	14R
Dallas/Fort Worth, TX	16L

Location	*Runway*
Dallas/Fort Worth, TX	34R
Installation:	
CAT I sites:	
St. Louis, MO	06
Islip, NY	15R
Newburgh, NY	27
Rantoul, IL	27
Manchester, NH	17
Colorado Springs, CO	17L
Orlando, FL	35R
New Orleans, LA	19
CAT II sites:	
New York, NY	22L
Pittsburgh, PA	10R
CAT III sites:	
Kansas City, MO	01R
Chicago, IL	27L
Chicago, IL	27R
Salt Lake City, UT	34F
Atlanta, GA	26R
Charlotte, NC	36R
Memphis, TN	35
Little Rock, AR	22R
St. Louis, MO	32L
Detroit Metro, MI	22
Boston, MA	33L
Louisville, KY	35L
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	36L
Chantilly, VA	01L

Instrument landing systems—Mark 1A, B, C—replace

Location	*Runway*
Installation:	
Boise, MT	10R
Lancaster, PA	8
Philadelphia, PA	27R
Los Angeles, CA	07L
Rutland, VT	19
Texarkana, TX	22
Hazelton, PA	28
Reedsville, PA	6
Houghton, MI	31
Elkins, WV	4
Parkersburg, WV	3
Traverse City, MI	28
International Falls, MN	31
Minneapolis, MN	22
Carbondale, PA	18L
Detroit Metro, MI	27R
Rockland, ME	3
Springfield, VT	5
St. Petersburg, FL	17L
Anniston, AL	5
Chesterfield, MO	08R
Dothan, AL	32
Hobbs, NM	3
Waco, TX	23
Hot Springs, AR	5
Lawrence, MA	5
New Orleans, LA	1

Instrument landing systems—GRN–27—replace

Location	*Runway*
Installation:	
Boston, MA	04R
Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	18R
FAA Academy, OK	

Location	*Runway*
Indianapolis, IN	05L
Los Angeles, CA	25L
Anchorage, AK	06R
Fairbanks, AK	01L
Andrews AFB, MD	19R
Greer, SC	03
New York (JFK), NY	13L
Philadelphia, PA	09R
Andrews AFB, MD	01L
Chicago, IL	14L
Pittsburgh, PA	10L
Salt Lake City, UT	34R
Huntsville, AL	18R
Spokane-Geiger, WA	21
Syracuse, NY	28
Nashville, TN	02L
New Orleans, LA	10
Sacramento (Metro), CA	16R
Spokane-Geiger, WA	3
San Francisco, CA	28R
St. Louis, MO	30R
Washington (National), DC	36
Bangor, ME	15
Bristol, TN	23

Note.—Changing conditions at airport locations may dictate that installation priorities be modified.

Runway visual range

Asheville, NC	Miami, FL
Atlanta, GA	North Myrtle Beach, SC
Atlanta, GA	Orlando, FL
Charleston, SC	Tampa, FL
Charlotte, NC	West Palm Beach, FL
Columbia, SC	Bakersfield, CA
Daytona Beach, FL	Carlsbad, CA
Fayetteville, NC	Las Vegas, NV
Fort Myers, FL	Modesto, CA
Hickory, NC	Redding, CA
Huntsville, AL	Reno, NV
Jackson, MS	Santa Maria, CA
Knoxville, TN	Stockton, CA
Lexington, KY	Van Nuys, CA

Note.—Changing conditions at airport locations may dictate that installation priorities be modified.

Visual navaids

	Runway
Establish precision approach path indicators [PAPI's]:	
Pittsburgh, PA	10C
Shreveport, LA	32
Homestead, FL	18
Bridgeport, CT	11
Tulluride, CO	27

Terminal air traffic control facilities

Funding for towers started in fiscal year 1990–94:
Little Rock, AR
Santa Barbara, CA
Covington, KY
Kansas City, MO
St. Louis, MO
Newark, NJ
Islip, NY
La Guardia, NY
Dallas (Addison), TX

Phase II funding for towers started in fiscal year 1995:
Merrill, AK
Birmingham, AL
Oakland, CA
Fort Lauderdale, FL
Salina, KS
St. Louis, MO
Manchester, NH
Columbus, OH
San Angelo, TX
Salt Lake City, UT
Newport News, VA
Roanoke, VA
Everett, WA
Phase I funding for towers started in fiscal year 1996:
Grand Canyon, AZ
Vero Beach, FL
Champaign, IL
Bedford, MA
Albany, NY
Abilene, TX
Corpus Christi, TX
Seattle, WA

PROCUREMENT AND MODERNIZATION OF NONAIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

The Committee recommends $92,400,000 for this budget category.

SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

NAS management automation program.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 of the original $2,000,000 requested. The House provided no funding for this activity. The Committee expects that the restored funding is necessary to achieve more cost-efficient management of the national airspace system infrastructure.

Child care facilities.—The House has provided double the amount requested for child care facilities. The Committee has provided the full amount requested by the administration, $2,600,000. Due to budget constraints faced by the Committee it believes that funding could be allocated to higher priority safety-related programs, and has reduced the House's allowance to the originally requested level.

Aviation security.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the aviation security line item, which is $3,000,000 more than requested by the administration. The Committee agrees with the House's observation that the procurement, installation, and testing of prototype aviation security equipment in airports is necessary, and that they should be ready in fiscal year 1996 for prototyping.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT MISSION SUPPORT

The Committee recommends $259,200,000 for this budget category.

Transition engineering support.—The Committee has provided the amount requested for transition engineering support, $50,000,000. This level is, however, $10,000,000 below the House allowance. The Committee agrees with the House's observation that new equipment must be installed and commissioned in a timely manner, but believes that the original request is sufficient to conduct the necessary transition engineering support work.

FAA system architecture.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for FAA system architecture, which will enable FAA to better manage and control software cost schedules and quality.

PERSONNEL AND RELATED EXPENSES

Personnel and related expenses.—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 above the administration's request for personnel and related expenses, and agrees with the House that positions which are already authorized need to be funded, in order to provide FAA the level of resources necessary to install the backlog of navigational and landing systems that have been procured with facilities and equipment dollars.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	$259,192,000
Budget estimate, 1996	267,661,000
House allowance	143,000,000
Committee recommendation	215,886,000

This appropriation finances research, engineering, and development programs to improve the national air traffic control system by increasing its safety, security, productivity, and capacity. The programs are designed to meet the expected air traffic demands of the future and to promote flight safety. The major objectives are to keep the current system operating safely and efficiently; to protect the environment; and to modernize the system through improvements in facilities, equipment, techniques, and procedures in order to insure that the system will safely and efficiently handle the volume of aircraft traffic expected to materialize in the future.

The bill includes $215,886,000 for research, engineering, and development. This level is $51,775,000 below the budget request and $72,886,000 above the House allowance. The Committee suggests the following allocation:

	Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
System development and infrastructure:				
System planning and resource management	$3,623,000	$3,953,000	$3,000,000	$3,700,000
Technical laboratory facility	5,800,000	9,598,000	5,800,000	8,800,000
Subtotal	9,432,000	13,551,000	8,800,000	12,500,000
Capacity and air traffic management technology:				
Air traffic management technology	9,174,000	9,875,000	.....	8,000,000
Oceanic automation program	10,649,000	10,470,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Terminal air traffic control automation [TATCA]	16,891,000	15,624,000	.....	.....
Runway incursion reduction	8,099,000	8,177,000	.....	8,000,000
System capacity, planning, and improvements	12,082,000	12,256,000	6,000,000	12,000,000
Cockpit technology	4,820,000	8,266,000	6,500,000	8,200,000

	Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
General Aviation and Vertical Technology Flight Program	4,837,000	3,327,000	2,629,000	2,600,000
Modeling, analysis, and simulation	9,631,000	7,807,000	2,000,000	4,000,000
Future airway facilities technology	800,000	3,403,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	76,983,000	79,205,000	25,129,000	50,800,000
Communications, navigation, and surveillance:				
Communications	18,080,000	15,367,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Navigation	14,922,000	15,963,000	10,000,000	15,963,000
Surveillance	3,962,000	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal	36,964,000	31,330,000	20,000,000	25,963,000
Weather	2,909,000	6,493,000	6,493,000	6,493,000
Airport technology	8,200,000	9,278,000	1,000,000	8,000,000
Aircraft safety technology:				
Aircraft systems fire safety	1,200,000	3,906,000	.....	.....
Advanced materials/structural safety	5,245,000	2,973,000	2,000,000	2,500,000
Propulsion and fuel systems	3,436,000	4,059,000	.....	4,055,000
Flight safety/atmospheric hazards research	5,000,000	4,173,000	4,173,000	4,173,000
Aging aircraft	25,000,000	21,415,000	15,000,000	21,415,000
Aircraft catastrophic failure prevention research	2,705,000	4,357,000	2,705,000	2,705,000
Fire research	4,500,000	4,604,000	.....	.....
Fire research and safety	.....	.....	5,700,000	5,700,000
General aviation renaissance	.....	1,005,000	.....	.....
Cabin safety	.....	1,055,000	.....	
Subtotal	47,086,000	47,547,000	29,578,000	40,548,000
System security technology:				
Explosives and weapons detection	23,675,000	33,179,000	23,000,000	30,000,000
Airport security technology integration	1,000,000	2,530,000	.....	1,500,000
Aviation security human factors	3,124,000	4,603,000	.....	3,000,000
Aircraft hardening	7,828,000	3,496,000	.....	3,400,000
Subtotal	35,627,000	43,808,000	23,000,000	37,900,000
Human factors and aviation medicine:				
Flightdeck/maintenance system	16,508,000	11,182,000	15,500,000	11,182,000
Air traffic control/airway facilities human factors	11,259,000	10,193,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Aeromedical research	4,233,000	4,485,000	2,500,000	4,000,000
Subtotal	32,000,000	25,860,000	28,000,000	25,182,000
Environment and energy	5,200,000	5,429,000	1,000,000	4,500,000
Innovative/cooperative research	4,800,000	5,160,000	.....	4,000,000
Total	259,192,000	267,661,000	143,000,000	215,886,000

The objectives of and Committee recommendations for the 10 major activities in FAA's Research, Engineering, and Development Program are discussed below.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Objectives: To provide (1) a systems engineering approach and benefit/cost analyses to the development of a comprehensive research, engineering, and development program and (2) visibility, accountability, coordination, and control of the research, engineering, and development activities.

The Committee has reduced the $13,551,000 request by $1,051,000.

The House has made a number of reductions to the system development and infrastructure line item, including $953,000 associated with advisory committee, and international program support. The Committee has restored these funds.

Advisory committee.—The Aviation Safety Research Act of 1988 directed FAA to establish an advisory committee to provide a strategic look at those research and development efforts that would encourage FAA to take advantage of current technology and interface with activities being performed with other Government agencies and research laboratories. The Committee believes that this is a good use of Federal funds and has restored the reduction associated with the advisory committee and funding associated with the work of the requirements and technical concepts for aviation [RTCA].

FAA Technical Center—Human Factors Laboratory.—The House has deleted the administration's request of $3,798,000 associated with a budget realignment treatment of resources of the FAA technical center. The Committee fully funds the administration request.

Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development.—The Committee supports the House position which maintains at the 1995 level the amount of resources for the Mitre support contract.

CAPACITY AND AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY

Objectives: To ensure that air traffic management operations safety is maintained and then improved, to increase system capacity and utilization of existing airspace and airport resources, and to accommodate greater user flexibility and efficiency.

Air traffic management technology.—The House has reduced the air traffic management technology category by $9,875,000. The Committee believes that restoration of these funds is necessary to avoid delays in the development of new traffic flow management capabilities for the air traffic control system. New flow management is necessary to appreciate fuel savings for air carriers and to support continued development high altitude routing systems. In addition, the Committee believes a real-time operational prototype system is necessary to provide FAA traffic managers with simulation capabilities to monitor and assess air carrier proposals regarding flight patterns and schedules and safe adoption of the free flight concept, as well as conflict resolution strategies.

Oceanic Automation Program.—The House has included $2,470,000 below what was requested for the Oceanic Automation Program. The Committee does not believe that the requested fund-

ing for this program is necessary at this particular time, and agrees with the House allowance. However, the Committee expects that FAA will continue to support the data link prototype system being installed in the Oakland center.

Terminal air traffic control automation [TATCA].—The House has recommended transferring $15,624,000 for the terminal air traffic control automation project to the "Facilities and equipment" account under the traffic flow management line item, and has directed the FAA to accelerate the center TRACON automation system program. The Committee agrees with the House recommendation in this area.

Runway incursion reduction.—The House has eliminated all funding under the "Research and development" account for the runway incursion reduction program, and recommends that these funds be used under the "Facilities and equipment" account line item AMASS. The Committee is concerned that a transfer of this funding under facilities and equipment would delay new communications and surveillance capabilities associated with automation improvements for surface traffic management. New nonradar solutions and evaluations are needed, and the Committee believes that if these funds are transferred to the "Facilities and equipment" account, the surface management advisor program would not be given the priority the Committee believes it should have. Therefore, the Committee recommendation is to restore $8,000,000 to the runway incursion reduction program.

System capacity planning and improvements.—The Committee has provided $12,000,000 for system capacity, planning, and improvements, which is virtually the fiscal year 1995 level.

Cockpit technology.—The House has reduced the administration's request under the cockpit technology by $1,766,000 due to higher priorities than the TCAS–IV research. The Committee has restored funding to this line item, believing that work is necessary on the software and logic development for TCAS–II avionics now operating in a significant number of aircraft. The Committee has, however, slightly reduced the request due to budget considerations.

General Aviation and Vertical Flight Technology Program.—The Committee has provided $2,600,000 for the Vertical Flight Program.

Modeling analysis and simulation.—The Committee believes that under the House's reduction, critical support for FAA's free flight initiative would be reduced. Free flight is a technique supported by the Committee and by U.S. air carriers in general. Therefore, the Committee has provided $4,000,000 for modeling analysis and simulation.

Future airway facilities technology.—The House has eliminated funding for this activity. The administration believes that the House reduction will result in total curtailment of R&D activities regarding the operational infra structure. The Committee believes that this research is operationally driven and can safely be deferred.

COMMUNICATIONS, NAVIGATION, AND SURVEILLANCE

Objectives: To develop and exploit high-quality communications, navigation, and surveillance services and make them available any-

where on the surface of the Earth, using satellite and data-link technologies when they are cost effective.

Communications.—The Committee agrees with the House's reduction in the communications line item to $10,000,000. The Committee believes that, under the funding provided, sufficient funding is available for the FAA to go forward on the aeronautical data link communications and aeronautical data link applications initiatives.

Navigation.—The House has provided $5,963,000 below the amount requested by the administration. The Committee has provided the requested amount for the navigation line item. The Committee is concerned that, under the House's reduction, important navigation initiatives such as the local area augmentation system, the wide area augmentation system, the GPS interference analysis, and the GPS safety notification system for pilots would be jeopardized, and, therefore, has provided the full amount requested for this line item.

WEATHER

Objectives: To improve the timeliness and accuracy of weather forecasting in order to enhance flight safety, increase system capacity, improve flight efficiency, reduce air traffic control [ATC] and pilot workload, improve flight planning, and increase productivity.

The Committee has provided the full amount of $6,493,000 requested by the administration and provided in the House allowance for the Weather Program.

AIRPORT TECHNOLOGY

Objectives: To provide new and improved standards, criteria, and guidelines to plan, design, construct, operate, and maintain the Nation's airports, heliports, and vertiports.

The House has reduced funding for the airport technology request from the requested level of $9,278,000 to $1,000,000 stating that such activities can be performed by the public sector. The Committee has restored funding to approximately last year's level of $8,000,000.

AIRCRAFT SAFETY TECHNOLOGY

Objectives: To develop technologies, standards, and maintenance regulations that maintain or improve aircraft safety in an evolving, changing, and demanding aviation environment.

Aircraft systems fire safety.—This line item has been merged with related activities in a new line item, fire research and safety.

Advanced materials/structural safety.—The Committee has restored $500,000 to the House allowance for advanced materials/structural safety. The Committee continues to support advanced composite materials research which leads to the support of certification and airworthiness regulations in the material and structural area.

Propulsion and fuel systems.—The Committee has restored the fiscal year 1996 budget request for propulsion and fuel systems, which the House zeroed out in its recommendation. Propulsion and fuel systems line items support engine reliability and alternative fuels research, including the engine titanium consortium which

conducts research centered on finding improved methods for detecting cracks and imperfections in aircraft engines to prevent in-flight engine breakup and failures.

Flight safety atmospheric hazards research.—The Committee has provided the full amount requested to continue the development of ice detector systems, the development of anti-icing materials, and to continue research on the effect of ice contamination on airplane stalls.

The Committee notes with approval FAA's current initiatives in the area of aircraft icing. Recent events have heightened awareness of this issue, particularly the serious nature of icing caused by supercooled large droplets. The Committee believes that this area should continue to receive priority consideration. An important element of improved safety in icing conditions is providing pilots with better tools for detecting ice. The research and testing programs underway at the Atlantic City Technical Center on wide area ice detection technology have already shown great promise. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of such technology at smaller regional airports the Committee directs the FAA to add the Rhinelander-Oneida County Airport as a test site for evaluation of innovative deicing technology. The Committee strongly recommends continued funding to make this advanced safety technology available to pilots as soon as possible.

Aging aircraft.—The Committee has provided the full amount requested for FAA's research in the aging aircraft area. This restores $6,415,000 above the House allocation. This research supports airborne data monitoring systems, corrosion fatigue research, and the Center for Aviation Systems Reliability and the Center of Excellence, which conduct research in these areas. The Committee is concerned that passenger enplanements are exceeding the current U.S. air carrier supply, and that carriers are relying increasingly on older-aged aircraft, which leads to increasing risk of failure, and has, therefore, provided the full amount requested in this area.

General aviation renaissance.—The Committee agrees with the House's reduction in the general aviation renaissance line item.

Cabin safety.—The Committee agrees with the House's reduction in the cabin safety line item. The FAA has appealed this cut, believing that the private sector would not fund research in this area. However, the Committee concurs with the House position, which holds that such research on airworthiness should and could be done by the private sector.

SYSTEM SECURITY TECHNOLOGY

Objectives: To enhance the security of passengers and crews in all aspects of aircraft, airports, and related ATC facilities by developing systems that prevent or deter terrorist activities.

Explosives and weapons detection.—The Committee has restored $7,000,000 to the House allowance, which still leaves a cut of $3,179,000 below the administration's request for the explosives and weapons detection line item. This activity is used to conduct research in trace and bulk detection of explosives and cargo screening. Given the increased terrorist threats and attacks, the Committee believes restoration of the requested funding is warranted.

Airport security technology integration.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for airport security technology integration. This line item supports computer and simulation tools used to plan integration of security systems in airports, so they will be better able to defend efficiently against terrorist attacks. The amount provided by the Committee is $500,000 above the fiscal year 1995 level.

Aviation security human factors.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the aviation security human factors research, which is approximately the amount provided in fiscal year 1995. Research in this area is used for domestic passenger profiling, screener training systems, and explosives detection system deployment support. The Committee believes that eliminating funding for this category as proposed by the House would delay recent progress for human systems integration in new security technologies.

Aircraft hardening.—The Committee has provided $3,400,000 for the aircraft hardening activity. The Committee believes that the House's funding level seriously jeopardizes FAA's ability to field test hardened cargo containers and to write final hardening specifications on containers and aircraft fuselages.

HUMAN FACTORS AND AVIATION MEDICINE

Objectives: To establish ways to improve the effectiveness of human performance in the operation of the aviation system and to seek better methods for preventing human error, accidents, and incidents.

Flight deck/maintenance system.—The House has added $4,318,000 above that requested in the flight deck, human factors, and aviation medicine category. The Committee believes that the funding requested by the administration is sufficient to continue its existing work with NASA and DOD under the national plan for aviation human factors.

Air traffic control/airway facilities human factors.—The Committee has provided the same level as the House, $10,000,000, for the human factors research in air traffic control and airway facilities, which is slightly less, by $193,000, than the requested amount.

Aeromedical research.—The Committee has restored the aeromedical research funding to $4,000,000, which is slightly less than the fiscal year 1995 level. However, under this level, the Committee expects that FAA will be able to adequately maintain its capability at the Civil Aeromedical Institute for Forensic Toxicological and Accident Research, and expects there will be no diminution in protection/survival related research.

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY

Objectives: To protect the environment, conserve energy, and keep the U.S. air transportation industry strong and competitive.

Environment and energy.—The Committee has provided $4,500,000 for the environment and energy line item. Under the House's reduction, the Committee was concerned that serious delays would be caused in environmental assessments, primarily in the noise area; that research and noise reduction technology would be delayed; and that necessary research in engine emissions reduction and control would be seriously curtailed, if not terminated.

Therefore, the Committee has provided $3,500,000 above the House allowance for the environment and energy line item.

INNOVATIVE/COOPERATIVE RESEARCH

Objectives: To maximize the total effectiveness of research, engineering, and development by incorporating the efforts of other Government agencies, the industry, and universities.

The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for innovative cooperative research.

Innovative/cooperative research.—The House has eliminated all funding for the innovative/cooperative research line item. This elimination would terminate all FAA research and development partnerships with industry, academia, and other government agencies. The Committee believes that funding is necessary in this area so that FAA will be able to best leverage scarce resources, and get the best return for its investment. This is a key funding source for cooperative research and development agreements [CRDA's] and small business innovation research contracts. The Committee has restored $4,000,000 for this activity.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Appropriations, 1995	($1,500,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(1,500,000,000)
House allowance	(1,500,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(1,500,000,000)
(Rescission)	(−5,000,000)

The Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended, authorizes a program of grants to fund airport planning and development and noise compatibility planning and projects for public use airports in all States and territories.

The Committee recommends $1,500,000,000 in liquidating cash for grants-in-aid for airports. This is consistent with the Committee's obligation limitation on airport grants.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The administration proposed to replace the Airport Grant Program with funding from the new Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP]. Airport projects previously funded in this account will be eligible for funding through UTIIP. Additionally, the UTIIP account specifically includes $218,027,822 to honor the fiscal year 1996 payments for existing airport letters of intent.

The bill also includes a limitation on obligations for airport development and planning grants which are financed under contract authority. The limitation recommended for fiscal year 1996 is $1,250,000,000. This is $350,000,000 below the House allowance and $250,000,000 below the budget request.

The recommended amount is intended to be sufficient to continue the important tasks of enhancing airport safety, ensuring that airport standards can be met, maintaining existing airport capacity, and developing additional capacity.

The Committee notes that a sizable alternative source of funding is now available to airports in the form of passenger facility charges [PFC's]. The first PFC charge began for airlines tickets issued on June 1, 1992. DOT data shows that as of April 3, 1995, 217 airports have been approved for collection of PFC's in the amount of $11,000,000,000. During calendar year 1994, airports collected $851,000,000 in PFC charges and $936,000,000 is estimated to be collected in calendar year 1995. Of the airports collecting PFC's, over 20 percent collected about 85 percent of the total, and all of these are either large or medium hub airports. DOT estimates that airports will collect between $750,000,000 and $780,000,000 in 1996, depending on the number of applications received and approved.

While large hubs collected most of the PFC funds during the last 2 years, small airports benefited significantly from these collections because of the redistribution mechanism in the PFC legislation. According to the provision, an airport collecting PFC's must have its apportionment under the AIP grant program reduced by 50 percent of the forecast PFC revenue, but the reduction cannot be more than one-half of the airport's earned apportionment for that fiscal year. FAA then redistributes these returned trust funds primarily to small airports. For example, in fiscal 1995 $88,000,000 that would have been distributed as grants based on passenger enplanements to PFC-charging airports is being redistributed to small airports. In 1996, FAA expects this redistributed amount to increase to about $101,800,000 under an obligation ceiling of $1,500,000,000. In redistributing these funds, FAA provides three-quarters of the total to the small airport fund, another 12.5 percent is available to small hubs, and the remaining 12.5 percent goes to FAA's discretionary account that can be provided to small, medium, or large airports. Therefore, even though the Committee's recommendation is $1,250,000,000 small airports should not be affected because they will have access in 1996 to this additional amount. And, as noted above, many other airports are supplementing their grant funds with PFC's.

AIP FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation [1]
Appropriation limitation	$1,500,000,000	$1,600,000,000	[1] $1,250,000,000
Entitlements:			
Primary airports	444,131,590	483,594,288	348,137,445
Cargo airports (3.5 percent)	41,968,276	48,743,796	27,414,413
Alaska supplemental	10,528,980	10,528,980	10,528,980
States (12 percent)	165,560,171	181,101,651	128,280,834
Carryover entitlements	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
Subtotal entitlements	762,189,017	823,968,715	614,361,673
Discretionary set asides:			
Noise (12.5 percent)	172,458,511	188,647,553	133,625,869

AIP FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—Continued

	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation [1]
Reliever airports (5 percent)	68,983,405	75,459,021	[1] 50,000,000
Commercial service (1.5 percent)	20,695,021	22,637,706	16,035,104
System planning (0.75 percent)	10,347,511	11,318,853	8,017,552
Military airport program (2.5 percent)	34,491,702	37,729,511	[1] 20,000,000
Subtotal discretionary set asides	306,976,150	335,792,645	227,678,526
Returned entitlements: Small airport/hub fund	105,834,833	115,238,641	82,959,801
Other discretionary:			
Capacity/safety/security/noise	243,750,000	243,750,000	243,750,000
Remaining discretionary	81,250,000	81,250,000	81,250,000
Subtotal other discretionary	325,000,000	325,000,000	325,000,000
Total entitlement	762,189,017	823,968,715	614,361,673
Total discretionary	737,810,983	776,031,285	635,638,327
Grand total	1,500,000,000	1,600,000,000	1,250,000,000

[1] Relievers capped at $50,000,000 and MAP capped at $20,000,000

Note: Based on preliminary enplanement data for calendar year 1994.

LETTERS OF INTENT

Congress authorized FAA to use letters of intent [LOI's] to fund multiyear airport improvement projects that will significantly enhance systemwide airport capacity. FAA is also to consider a project's benefits and costs in determining whether to approve it for AIP funding. FAA adopted a policy of committing to LOI's no more than about 50 percent of forecasted AIP discretionary funds allocated for capacity, safety, security, and noise projects. The Committee viewed this policy as reasonable because it gave FAA the flexibility to fund other worthy projects that do not fall under a LOI. Both FAA and airport authorities have found letters of intent helpful in planning and funding airport development.

The Committee appreciates the complexity of assessing a project's impact on systemwide capacity but believes that FAA should do its best in this regard before committing future AIP funds under a LOI. Further, with reduced discretionary funding in fiscal year 1995, FAA will have difficulty both meeting LOI commitments and funding other needed projects. This is due, in part, to FAA planning LOI funding commitments on the basis of a higher level of discretionary funds.

The Committee in the past was concerned that FAA had not exercised sufficient control over the use of LOI's. This means that some commitments could be in jeopardy if AIP funding levels are significantly reduced. Accordingly, to maintain program integrity and ensure LOI commitments are met, the Committee repeats its recommendation that FAA be granted the authority to award new LOI's only after (1) scheduled LOI payments fall to less than 50 percent of AIP discretionary funds and (2) FAA has improved its ability to estimate airport development projects' impact on systemwide capacity.

The letters of intent program assumes the following fiscal year 1996 grant allocations:

California: Sacramento Metropolitan	$4,780,000
Colorado: Denver International	29,911,145
Florida:	
Daytona Beach Regional	1,700,000
Jacksonville International	4,977,019
Georgia: Savannah International	2,000,000
Illinois: Scott AFB (reliever)	14,000,000
Indiana: Indianapolis International	11,113,622
Kentucky:	
Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky	17,300,000
Standiford Field, Louisville	15,900,000
Louisiana: New Orleans International	11,800,000
Michigan: Detroit Metropolitan	15,500,000
Mississippi: Golden Triangle Regional	400,000
Nevada: Reno Cannon International	6,500,000
New York: Greater Buffalo International	9,558,650
Rhode Island: Theodore F. Green State	6,500,000
South Carolina: Hilton Head	532,293
Tennessee:	
Nashville International	2,180,000
Memphis International	13,750,000
Texas:	
Austin (new)	11,430,113
Dallas/Fort Worth International	12,500,000
Miller International	594,980
Virginia:	
Washington Dulles International	1,500,000
Washington National	23,600,000
Total	218,027,822

Two sources exist to fund FAA's commitment to an airport's LOI. One is the discretionary portion of FAA's airport improvement program appropriation, and the other is the entitlement funding that an airport receives through the AIP on the basis of its passenger enplanements. Even though FAA expects an airport receiving an LOI to put all of its entitlement funding toward the project being funded by the LOI, this source provides only about one-quarter of the annual LOI funding. Thus, of the $218,000,000 that FAA has committed to LOI's during fiscal year 1996, the Committee estimates that approximately $170,400,000 will need to come from the AIP's discretionary limitation. As shown in the preceding AIP funding chart under both the House and Senate levels would provide sufficient discretionary funding to cover LOI's; however, little flexibility is left to fund other high-priority capacity projects not included under an LOI.

Applications are pending for capacity enhancement projects which would, if constructed, significantly reduce congestion and delay. These projects require multiyear funding commitments. The Committee recommends that the FAA enter into letters of intent for multiyear funding of such capacity enhancement projects. While letters of intent would be subject to future appropriations, they represent an important component of the Airport Improvement Program. The Committee understands that an application for a letter of intent is pending for construction of a new dependent runway for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Subject to the completion of the required environmental review, the Committee supports the expeditious consideration of SEA-TAC's application for the letter of

intent with the project sponsor for construction of the runway project.

Northwest Arkansas Regional airport.—In fiscal year 1995, the Committee endorsed the expeditious consideration of a multiyear letter of intent for the Northwest Arkansas Regional Airport. The Committee understands that the Federal Aviation Administration is now considering the issuance of master agreements for multiyear development projects. The Committee still encourages the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into a letter of intent or master agreement that allows for future reimbursement of all allowable costs related to the approved project. The region's existing airport can not meet future demands because of the area's profound growth in population and economic activity.

Huntsville International Airport.—The Committee is disappointed that the FAA has not provided a discretionary grant to the Huntsville International Airport for an urgently needed runway-taxiway rehabilitation project during this fiscal year, despite the Committee's expressed interest in having this project fully funded through a discretionary improvement funds allocation this year. Given that this project is a high FAA priority and has been deemed an eligible recipient for a discretionary grant by the administration, the Committee disapproves of FAA's delay in funding the project and FAA's attempt to earmark the airport's regular entitlement funds for the taxiway portion of the project. Therefore, the Committee directs the FAA to provide $2,100,000 in discretionary improvement grant funding to the Huntsville International Airport for the project no later than the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1996.

Tunica, MS, airport.—The Committee commends to FAA's attention the recent developments in the region around the Tunica, MS, airport. Given recent economic developments in the area, major infrastructure improvements and expansion are necessary to keep up with current and projected traffic, and the Committee directs FAA to work with officials of the airport on future capital improvements.

Midland International Airport.—The Committee is aware of the Federal Aviation Administration's past practices on issuance of letters-of-intent to qualified airports which assists them in obtaining financing for physical improvements as part of the Airport Improvements Program [AIP]. The Committee believes letters-of-intent serve a useful role in allowing airports to more effectively plan long-term financing. The Committee urges consideration of an AIP application from the Midland International Airport for the construction of a new terminal to enhance capacity and promote safety by increasing ramp areas and resolving a control tower line-of-sight problem, and encourages the FAA to work with Midland officials either in the letter-of-intent process or an alternative mechanism on these improvements.

Philadelphia International Airport [PHL].—The Committee further understands that an application for a letter of intent for multiyear funding of $120,000,000 is pending for construction of a new parallel runway for Philadelphia International Airport, which is needed to provide a level of service sufficient for residents and businesses in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. The airport has demonstrated that its local share of the project costs will

consist of airport revenue bonds and a steady stream of passenger facility charges. Given that capacity constraints have caused considerable delays at the airport, leading to annual costs in the millions of dollars, the Committee calls for the FAA to enter into a letter of intent with the project sponsor for construction of the runway project.

AIRCRAFT PURCHASE LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

(LIMITATION ON BORROWING AUTHORITY)

Appropriations, 1995	($9,970,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(1,600,000)
House allowance	(1,600,000)
Committee recommendation	(1,600,000)

The Aircraft Purchase Loan Guarantee Program was established pursuant to Public Law 85–307, as amended, which gave the Secretary of Transportation the authority to provide Government guarantees of private loans to certain air carriers for the purchase of modern aircraft and equipment when financing was not otherwise available on reasonable terms. The authority to provide new guarantees expired on October 23, 1983.

The accompanying bill contains authority for the Secretary of Transportation to borrow funds from the Treasury to cover the costs of aircraft loan defaults by air carriers on existing loans.

This program is continuing only for the purpose of making payments to private lenders upon default of existing loans by air carriers. No new loan guarantees are expected.

The Committee has included bill language, as requested, that permits the Secretary of Transportation to borrow up to $1,600,000 from the Secretary of the Treasury to pay for defaulted loans.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1996 PROGRAM

The principal missions of the Federal Highway Administration are: administration, in cooperation with the States, of the Federal-aid Highway Construction Program, including the interstate, primary, bridge, secondary, and urban programs; regulation and enforcement of Federal requirements relating to the safety of operation and equipment of commercial motor carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; and governing the safety in movement over the Nation's highways of dangerous cargoes such as explosives, flammables, and other hazardous material.

Under the Committee recommendation, a total program level of $19,439,432,000 would be provided for the activities of the Federal Highway Administration for fiscal year 1996.

The following table summarizes the fiscal year 1995 program levels, the fiscal year 1996 budget estimates, the House allowance, and the Committee's recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1995 program level [1]	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendations
Limitation on general operating expenses	(521,796)	[2] (689,486)	(495,381)	(548,434)
Highway-related safety grants [3]	10,800	10,000	10,000	13,000
Rescission	−20,000			
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(10,800)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(13,000)
Federal-aid highways [3]	17,160,000	[4] 200,000	18,000,000	17,000,000
Exempt Federal-aid obligations (CA)	2,589,803	80,000	2,311,932	2,333,591
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(17,000,000)	(19,200,000)	(19,200,000)	(19,200,000)
Right-of-way revolving fund [5]	42,500			
Motor carrier safety grants [3]	74,000	85,000	79,150	75,000
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(73,000)	(68,000)	(68,000)	(68,000)
Motor carrier safety [6]	50,000			
Other highway programs	366,055			39,500
Rescission	−12,004			
Total	20,211,154	375,000	20,401,082	19,461,591

[1] Includes reductions pursuant to sections 323, 330, and 331 of Public Law 103–331.
[2] Proposed for funding as a drawdown within UTIIP.
[3] Obligation limitation on contract authority.
[4] Obligation limitation on demonstration programs; balance of program is replaced by UTIIP.
[5] Limitation on direct loans, included in totals.
[6] Proposed for separate funding contingent upon enactment of UTIIP; included within limitation on general operating expenses in 1995.

LIMITATION ON GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	($521,796,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	[1] (639,486,000)
House allowance	(495,381,000)
Committee recommendation	(548,434,000)

[1] Included under UTIIP.

The limitation on general operating expenses controls spending for virtually all the salaries, expenses, and research and development programs of the Federal Highway Administration.

The Committee recommends that a limitation of $548,434,000 be provided for salaries and expenses of the Federal Highway Administration.

The following table reflects the Committee's recommendation, the House allowance, and that requested by the administration.

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Administrative expenses	261,225	304,714	253,525
Motor carrier safety	([1])	([2])	46,000
Contract programs:			
Highway research, development, and technology	79,706	55,772	58,574
Intelligent vehicle/highway systems research	238,579	93,250	139,179
Technology assessment and deployment	17,241	11,622	14,622
Long-term pavement performance	10,701	8,489	10,500
National Highway Institute	4,369	4,369	4,369
Local Technical Assistance Program	3,015	3,015	3,015

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
International transportation	500	500	500
Technical assistance—Russia	400	400	400
Minority business	10,000	10,000	10,000
OJT support services	5,000	.....	5,000
Truck dynamic test facility	1,500	750	750
Transportation investment analysis	2,250	.....	.....
Cost allocation study (truck size and weight)	5,000	2,500	2,000
Accountwide adjustment	.....	−5,252	.....
Total limitation	639,486	495,381	548,434

[1] The administration's request funds motor carrier safety administrative expenses in a separate account at $50,000,000.
[2] The House includes motor carrier safety administrative expenses within the overall FHWA administrative expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Because of budgetary limitations, the Committee's allowance includes the following reductions from the budget request:

Information resource management	−$2,000,000
Equipment	−1,500,000
Travel and transportation of persons	−2,000,000
Career development program	−1,000,000
Transportation of things	−200,000
Other category	−1,000,000

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS

The Committee recommends $46,000,000 for motor carrier safety operations, not including the funding of $7,774,000 for research which is included in the research, development, and technology line.

The Committee's recommendation includes $4,800,000 for ADP deployment and information processing, which is $300,000 more than requested. Required reductions may not be taken from any field activity directly supporting the conduct of compliance reviews or reviews of CDL implementation. OMC shall minimize the amount of funds spent on providing educational materials and technical assistance on the Federal motor carrier safety regulations to nongovernmental entities. None of the positions proposed for elimination shall be from positions allocated for personnel who conduct compliance reviews or are regulatory specialists. When OMC responds satisfactorily to the suggestions and directives identified in this report, the Committee will consider funding the amount requested for this program.

The Committee acknowledges several substantial accomplishments recently achieved by the OMC. For example, OMC has instituted an effective accident countermeasures program that provides targeted advice to specific motor carriers; has improved its safety fitness rating methodology to incorporate more performance-based information; and has designed and ensured successful testing of the ASPEN pen-based computer system, which has been well received by the MCSAP community. This Agency has also created an analysis unit which will provide the necessary data on which to base future regulatory actions and program changes. In addition, OMC

has vigorously pursued the Committee's directive to establish 200 MCSAP sites equipped with the latest ITS technology by mid-1997. The Committee is most pleased with the progress of the inspection selection system and recognizes the substantial contribution that various members of the MCSAP community and the University of North Dakota made in the development of this software. The recent truck and bus safety summit, which was sponsored by OMC, has yielded substantial input to help guide OMC's future program.

There are, however, numerous areas of concern regarding the OMC program which demand increased and immediate attention by the FHWA Administrator. These include the following:

One, although FHWA has identified more than 70 problems or shortcomings that interfere with full and effective implementation of the Commercial Drivers License [CDL] Program, these issues persist and will require more definitive actions. Some actions will require legislation which has not yet been sought by FHWA. As long as these remaining problems exist, FHWA and the States will not be able to ensure that each commercial driver only has one license and that convictions for certain unsafe driving actions adversely affects CDL issuance or suspension—basic tenets of the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986. Furthermore, 2 years ago, the Committee asked for specific data to assess CDL effectiveness on a State-by-State basis. The Committee still awaits this information.

Before next year's hearing, the Committee directs FHWA, with substantial input and consultation with the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators and NHTSA, to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees a detailed report identifying each of the constraints to more effective implementation of the CDL Program; specifying regulatory, administrative and legislative changes that are needed to address each of these concerns; and presenting a timetable for action to address each constraint. To help address some of these concerns, the Committee's allowance includes $150,000 which shall be spent to work with judges, prosecutors, and court systems to improve CDL implementation.

Two, for more than 5 years, the Committee has stressed the importance of a vigorous but fair motor carrier safety enforcement program. A year or so after the 1990 Motor Carrier Safety Act, FHWA responded with substantial improvements in the effectiveness and productivity of its enforcement program. But more recently, FHWA submitted information that indicates the vitality and vigor of its enforcement activities may be waning. For example, a comparison of fiscal year 1994 to fiscal year 1993 data shows that the number of enforcement cases closed decreased, the amount of civil penalties assessed and collected decreased, and the number of compliance reviews conducted by Federal safety specialists decreased. The Committee is especially displeased that the number of reviews of hazardous materials carriers and shippers also has dropped precipitously during the last few years. Unfortunately, OMC has disbanded its hazardous materials unit in headquarters, leaving less central leadership for the 30 or more Hazmat safety specialists and managers in the field.

While this decrease in the vitality of OMC's enforcement presence was occurring, the number of deaths resulting from crashes

involving trucks weighing 10,000 pounds or more has been increasing, going from 4,767 in 1992, 4,849 in 1993, to 5,112 in 1994. The number of non-fatal injuries from crashes involving these trucks also increased from 109,000 in 1992 to 133,000 in 1994. With roughly one-third of the vehicles/or drivers declared out-of-service for critical safety violations at the roadside, and with about 40 percent of rated carriers unable to achieve a satisfactory safety rating, there is no excuse for anything less than a vigorous enforcement program. The Committee repeats the finding of Congress in the Motor Carrier Safety Act of 1990 which stated, " relying primarily upon voluntary compliance methods has not resulted in an acceptable level of commercial motor vehicle safety."

Although the extraction of civil penalties is not an end onto itself, there is substantial documentation that this method of promoting compliance gets the attention of many of those truck and bus companies that violate the Federal motor carrier safety regulations. The Committee is concerned that the benefit to be derived from this enforcement tool is not being maximized. OMC needs to remember that a strong civil penalty program helps promote compliance with the safety requirements and reduces risks to the public.

In response to concerns raised in last year's report, the FHWA Administrator wrote the Committee stating that "Enforcement casework from Federal staff reviews has likely reached a peak for a variety of reasons * * *." The Committee vigorously questions whether FHWA should be willing to settle for stagnation in its enforcement workload in order to accommodate the achievement of other missions.

The Committee believes that too much time spent on total quality management task forces, education and technical assistance on regulatory requirements, economic regulatory compliance issues related to the international fuel tax agreement and the International Registration Program, unnecessary training unrelated to the basic missions of the Agency, and lengthy strategic planning sessions are interfering with the fundamental mission of OMC. The Office of the Secretary and the FHWA Administrator are urged to reduce unnecessary demands on OMC that interfere with the conduct of basic safety functions, especially those related to enforcement activities.

Time spent on these secondary activities needs to be balanced with more time spent on the primary safety/enforcement mission of the Agency. Accordingly, the Committee directs OMC to maximize the safety and compliance benefits derived from the work of OMC safety specialists. This strategy must include an increase in the number of more effective compliance reviews. The Committee reminds the Administrator that the Motor Carrier Safety Acts of 1984 and 1990 are clear legislative statements of the congressional intent that enforcement is a critical function of OMC.

FHWA stated to the Committee that "* * * our efforts should be measured by improvements in safety." The Committee would like to see quantitative evidence next year of improvements in safety statistics and a revitalization of a much stronger enforcement program. The Committee requests the Associate Administrator for Motor Carriers to review critical positions in the field and in headquarters to examine whether additional positions can be assigned

to conduct an increased number of targeted compliance reviews and other effective safety strategies, to consider how the hazardous materials program can be revitalized, and to evaluate the use of field staff time on activities other than CDL implementation, MCSAP, and compliance reviews.

The Committee strongly believes that the best customer service that OMC can provide is to ensure that the public suffers less of the tragic results of crashes involving commercial motor vehicles.

In fairness to OMC, it should be noted that this Agency is spending a substantial amount of time working with its State partners to improve their activities. This training activity may reduce the productivity of Federal personnel in the short term, but over the long term, it improves the Federal/State partnership in commercial motor vehicle safety. OMC also can document many cases in which a motor carrier that was subject to intensive scrutiny or enforcement actions by OMC improved its safety rating and had a reduction in accident frequency.

Three, some OMC regional directors are dedicated toward implementing a vigorous enforcement program, others appear to be less inclined. Data submitted by FHWA show that three of the regions are issuing more than 90 percent of the compliance or consent orders and that six of the regions are rarely using these enforcement tools. The Committee directs FHWA to issue comprehensive, uniform, and updated guidance for more effective and uniform implementation of its enforcement program.

Four, although the Committee was assured that FHWA would use fiscal year 1995 funds to conduct a study on the role of shippers in promoting noncompliance with the safety regulations, this contract was postponed without prior notice to the Committee. Fiscal year 1996 research funds will be used to support contract work in this area.

Five, despite the 1991 MCSAP reauthorization statute, only three States conduct onsite reviews of hazardous materials shippers. Despite encouragement from the Committee, FHWA has not been persuasive in convincing States to expand the scope of their coverage to this key component of hazardous materials transportation safety.

In view of these illustrative concerns, which are probably symptomatic of an array of problems, the Committee directs FHWA's Office of Program Review to conduct a comprehensive review of the functioning and operation of the Office of Motor Carriers. At a minimum, the following topics should be considered: the adequacy of the civil penalty process in light of an increasing number of fatalities and injuries resulting from crashes involving commercial motor vehicles, ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the compliance review process, and ways to assign more staff to the field to increase contact with the commercial motor vehicle industry. This review and relevant recommendations for improvement should be submitted to the FHWA Administrator with copies forwarded to the House and Senate Committee's on Appropriations before June 1996.

FHWA is unlikely for at least 2 or more years to issue final regulations to revise current hours-of-duty status (hours-of-service) requirements and address all of the concerns raised by the NTSB in

its recent work on driver fatigue. FHWA has been working on possible revisions to these regulations since the 1970's, with an intensified program since the late 1980's. Although the issues involved are indeed complex, the Committee believes this rulemaking process must be placed on a definitive timetable. The Committee directs FHWA to issue an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking dealing with a variety of fatigue-related issues (including 8 hours of continuous sleep after 10 hours of driving, loading and unloading operations, automated and tamper-proof recording devices, rest and recovery cycles, fatigue and stress in longer combination vehicles, fitness for duty, and other appropriate regulatory and enforcement countermeasures for reducing fatigue-related incidents and increasing driver alertness) no later than March 1, 1996. This ANPRM must be followed by an NPRM within 1 year, and a final rulemaking or a final decision not to proceed with additional regulations in this area no later than 2 years thereafter. FHWA should not expect any substantial funding increase in its motor carrier research or operations programs unless satisfactory progress is demonstrated in this area.

HIGHWAY RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommends a total of $58,574,000 to be distributed as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Activity/program element	Program level, 1995	Budget estimate, 1996	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Highway research and development:				
Safety	7,768	9,690	8,768	9,790
Materials	5,451	.....	.....	.....
Pavements	7,476	9,283	9,247	10,027
Structures	6,311	12,486	13,211	13,211
Environment	5,593	6,481	5,593	5,593
Right-of-way	429	429	429	429
Policy	6,681	8,434	5,681	5,681
Planning	6,069	7,895	6,069	6,069
Motor carrier	7,774	9,008	6,774	7,774
NSTC priority projects	.....	16,000	.....	.....
Total, highway research and development	53,552	79,706	55,772	58,574

Safety.—The Committee recommends $9,790,000 for highway safety research and development [R&D]. The combination of various ISTEA and general operating expenses [GOE] funds will result in a fiscal year 1996 highway safety R&D program of not less than $13,790,000 of new authority. This amount is derived by adding $9,790,000 of GOE funds and $4,000,000 for safety R&D out of the section 6005 program. During fiscal year 1995, FHWA plans to spend $4,000,000 on safety R&D out of the section 6005 program. Within the funds provided, the Committee recommends $100,000 to be allocated to a national organization to help implement ongoing public information and education campaigns conducted by State

and local volunteers working to promote highway/rail grade crossing safety.

The Committee also supports the development of enhanced research and demonstration activities into a safety initiative for older drivers and special user groups. An older drivers initiative should seek to demonstrate technologies and practices that improve the driving performance of older drivers at risk of losing their licenses to operate motor vehicles. Demonstration activities should be conducted initially in States which have the highest population of aging citizens for which driving is their primary means of mobility.

Pavements.—The Committee recommends $10,027,000 for pavements R&D, including $1,000,000 to advance the use of high performance concrete as proposed by the National Science and Technology Council [NSTC]. In addition, the Committee reiterates its support for research in composite materials and directs that not less than $1,000,000 be available for a joint university/industry effort in the area where Federal funding is privately matched (which could include in-kind contributions).

Structures.—The Committee recommends $13,211,000 for structures R&D, including $3,000,000 for a project proposed by the NSTC.

Structures research deals with construction, repair, and rehabilitation of the highway infrastructure; system management to increase service life; and structural safety for heavier traffic loads on highway bridges.

Environment.—The Committee has provided the same level of funding as provided in fiscal year 1995.

Transportation systems noise prediction.—The Committee recognizes that transportation systems represent a major source of community noise. The Department has a continuing responsibility to monitor the environmental impact of such noise and provide guidance to States and local communities on the impact of changing traffic patterns, new construction and other transportation related noise.

The Committee supports a grant to the National Center for Physical Acoustics to develop and verify improved models to predict community noise. The Secretary will establish sources and scenarios of highest priority to the Department and may choose to direct the National Center for Physical Acoustics to apply acoustic or ultrasonic techniques to monitor traffic and/or pipeline maintenance.

Right-of-way.—The Committee has provided the full amount requested by the administration.

Policy.—The Committee has provided $5,681,000 for policy research which is $1,000,000 below the fiscal year 1995 level. The Committee encourages FHWA to continue its work on private sector participation in highway financing.

Planning.—The goal of the planning program is to develop and disseminate improved planning methods, congestion management procedures, intermodal procedures, statewide planning methods, and to assist State and local transportation agencies. The Committee has included $6,069,000, the same as the fiscal year 1995 level and the House allowance.

Motor carrier.—Because of budgetary limitations and inadequate justification of portions of the request, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,774,000 for motor carrier research. The Committee notes the substantial expansion of this program during the last few years and suggests that a more careful review of research proposals by experts within and outside of FHWA is needed. Associated funding such as the ITS/CVO program and MCSAP R&D also has increased in recent years. Research projects funded in these areas were previously included under this category.

In Senate Report 103–150, the Committee complimented OMC for its first 5-year strategic plan on motor carrier research. The Committee agrees with the House that an updated plan is necessary and requests that this plan also review the progress made against the objectives specified in the first strategic plan previously submitted to the Committee. A draft plan should be submitted for review by the National Motor Carrier Advisory Committee during its September 1996 meeting as well as by other experts within and outside FHWA for comment. The plan will pay particular attention to the future course of OMC's human factors research with special emphasis on driver fatigue. The plan will identify the scope and nature of future projects in this area, and present an analysis of how this research lays the foundation for timely rulemakings and responses to relevant recommendations of the National Transportation Safety Board. The plan will detail how and when FHWA will complete research on questions pertaining to work and rest cycles, off-duty time, and adequate rest in team driving operations. An initial draft of the final plan shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before April 1, 1996, and the final plan shall be submitted no later than February 1, 1997. The plan also should detail the future direction of the ITS/CVO program and the MCSAP R&D activities.

Because the scientific basis for future rulemakings must be sound, FHWA is directed to restructure its fiscal year 1996 research program in such a way as to ensure that not less than $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated for motor carrier R&D will be used for work on driver fatigue (including sleep apnea) and issues associated with possible revisions to regulations dealing with hours-of-duty status. This allocation would be consistent with the results of the recent truck and bus safety summit, which concluded that the No. 1 issue deserving attention was driver fatigue. This research will include work on loading/unloading vehicles, fatigue related to local or short hauls, sleeper berth issues, and driver fitness for duty testing. Furthermore, OMC is directed to sign a contract before November 1, 1995, to conduct a research project to determine the scope, nature, and extent of shipper involvement in noncompliance with the safety regulations.

The Committee has included $1,500,000 above that requested for studies:

(*a*) To identify and field test technological interventions to offset driver fatigue. The congressionally directed study on driver fatigue and alertness has generated a wealth of data on the causes and incidence of both drowsy and alert driving in truckdrivers, as well as descriptions of numerous devices purported to alert drivers before the onset of drowsiness. This study would examine the most prom-

ising technologies, test them in a controlled environment, and field test them in actual trucking operations. Particular emphasis would be placed on alerting functions tied to known periods of reduced human performance.

(*b*) To determine the extent of various scheduling practices and their influence on truckdriver fatigue. Cargo delivery schedules have tended to become less flexible in recent years as shippers reduce their inventory costs and rely on trucks to deliver cargo at the exact time it is required. The smallest delays can induce truckers to drive faster, work longer hours, or give up sleep in order to make up for lost time. This study would survey a wide variety of drivers, motor carriers, and shippers to determine the prevalence of various scheduling practices, and randomly sample driver logs to determine correlations between the scheduling practices and hours of service.

The Committee recognizes that the amount of funds recommended herein is insufficient for OMC to conduct a study on freight mobility or to examine routing of hazardous materials shipments near prisons. The Committee's recommendation does not include any funds for outreach and technical assistance to regulated entities, to help complete program uniformity activities, or to eliminate barriers to effective intermodal freight transportation.

National Science Transportation Council [NSTC] priority projects.—The Committee's allowance does not include the $16,000,000 requested for the NSTC priority projects for three reasons: (1) budgetary limitations; (2) the need to reserve funds for FHWA's core infrastructure research, development, and technology programs; and (3) because this proposal was not subject to intensive peer review through FHWA's technical working groups and Research and Technology Executive Board. Nevertheless, the Committee recognizes the importance of improving the Nation's physical infrastructure and has carefully reviewed the request for NSTC priority projects. The Committee agrees with the House recommendation to incorporate within the pavements and structures R&D programs funds for two key research projects that were identified by the NSTC. Thus, the Committee recommends $1,000,000 to accelerate the utilization of high-performance concrete. The Committee's recommendation also includes $3,000,000 as part of the structures R&D program to construct or use one or more facilities that would evaluate and calibrate bridge and pavement nondestructive evaluation [NDE] technologies. FHWA shall select appropriate sites through competitive evaluations which consider the technical expertise and experience associated with the facility, infrastructure resources, proximity to an established university or research facility experienced in NDE technologies and composite materials, and access for Federal staff.

INTELLIGENT VEHICLE HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

The administration's request of $238,579,000 for intelligent vehicle/highway systems [IVHS] included $27,479,000 for research and $22,500,000 for operational testing. The Committee directs that funding be provided only up to the level specified for the projects listed below, with funding for other operational testing projects to be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary.

The Committee recommends a total of $139,179,000 to be distributed as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Program level, 1995	Budget estimate, 1996	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Intelligent vehicle highway system:				
Research and development	35,000	27,479	25,000	24,479
Operational tests	22,500	22,500	18,750	45,000
Commercial vehicle operations	10,700	10,700	12,700	15,700
Automated highway system	10,000	18,700	10,000	17,500
Advanced technology applications	15,000	15,000	2,500	.....
Priority corridors	10,000	10,000	.....	10,000
Crash avoidance research [1]	.....	17,200	13,000	15,000
Trailblazer initiative	.....	100,000	.....	.....
Program and systems support	11,300	17,000	11,300	11,500
Total IVHS	114,500	238,579	93,250	139,179

[1] $7,500 in 1995 is counted under NHTSA head.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $24,479,000 for the IVHS Research and Development Program.

IVHS operational tests.—The Committee recommends $45,000,000 for the operational test program. Of this amount, $20,000,000 will be allocated to conduct at least four different operational tests. In combination, these operational tests will achieve the following objectives: advance the results of R&D on traffic management systems including new approaches for traffic surveillance, provide an opportunity to test different institutional or partnership arrangements to further data integration on traffic systems, advance CVO technology of critical importance to safety, test various elements of systems architecture or advance standards development, and fill critical technology needs identified in the national ITS program plan.

The remainder of these program funds will be used to initiate two operational tests that will integrate the use of core infrastructure features, including those dealing with advanced traffic management systems and advanced traveler information systems, and simultaneously test the evolving national systems architecture. Testing the feasibility of integrating the core infrastructure will yield data on benefits and costs on ITS services and allow decisionmakers to view real world demonstrations of multiple ITS technologies working together. In addition, these operational tests of ITS integration will provide data to expedite the standards setting process. For these two projects, FHWA will: (1) require at least 50 percent cost sharing (hard and soft match); (2) maximize the use of the private sector and give priority to innovative financial and operational considerations; and (3) give priority to areas in which much of the core infrastructure has been established.

Commercial vehicle operations [CVO].—The Committee's allowance includes $15,700,000 for the commercial vehicle operations portion of the national ITS program, which is $5,000,000 above the administration's request. Consistent with past guidance, the primary focus of the CVO Program shall be on promoting the safety

of commercial vehicles and drivers. The Committee's allowance includes the $3,550,000 requested to improve and operate the SAFER and supporting information systems, which helps ensure that high-risk motor carriers receive a priority for inspections. FHWA informed the Committee that it plans to improve the current carrier-based SAFER system so that vehicle- and driver-specific inspection information can be provided to MCSAP officers. To ensure that this happens in a timely fashion, the Committee's recommendation includes $1,000,000 to equip at least 50 additional sites across the Nation by mid-1998 with the SAFER/inspection system that will provide information on recently declared out-of-service vehicles and other vehicle- and driver-specific safety data. This technology will be especially useful in improving compliance with out-of-service orders.

Within the funds provided, the Committee has included $6,000,000 for the development and initial pilot testing of the CVO communications infrastructure. This system, which will benefit the traveling public, the States, and the motor carrier industry, will support the transfer and linking of information systems necessary to facilitate a variety of user services. These services pertain to fuel tax payments, vehicle registration, overweight permits, and safety information.

The Joint Program Office and the FHWA must ensure that the CVO communications infrastructure, also known as the commercial vehicle information systems network [CVISN], and other associated systems will provide at the earliest possible date driver-, carrier-, and vehicle-specific information to officers at the roadside. The testing of the system must include license readers and other cross referencing technology which will link license plate numbers to U.S. DOT numbers and provide information on specific vehicles without transponders. None of the funds provided herein will be used for the purchase of transponders, except for identification systems that are to be used exclusively by the enforcement community.

Since automated clearance and one-stop shopping will be of major benefit to various CVO stakeholders, FHWA should vigorously pursue cost-sharing opportunities with the private sector and the States in all stages of this project. FHWA should consider the feasibility of eventually turning the entire information network over to a non-Federal entity. FHWA should be prepared to report on a plan to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations outlining cost-sharing arrangements and specifying how the operating and maintenance responsibility for the information system will eventually be transferred to a non-Federal entity.

The Committee strongly encourages the FHWA, working with the Joint Program Office, to develop a spending plan that would allow completion of the development and pilot testing of the CVO communications infrastructure within a budget ceiling considerably below the $17,500,000 originally planned.

In order to ensure that only the highest-priority projects are funded, the Committee's recommendation includes not more than $250,000 for outreach and institutional activities, $200,000 for emergency response systems, and no funds for a study on freight mobility.

Automated highway systems.—The Committee recommends $17,500,000 for the AHS project. The Committee recognizes the importance of this long-term project to the Nation's transportation future and the substantial commitment of the numerous partners to this project. The amount recommended is judged adequate to maintain the initial partnership agreement, but will require an extension of this project beyond the original 7-year duration.

Advanced technology applications.—The Committee has not included additional funds for the Advanced Technology Applications Program. The Committee notes that the Department of Defense [DOD] supports the Defense Reinvestment and Conversion Program. DOT must work more closely with the DOD and the Office of Science and Technology Policy to ensure increased use of these funds to achieve the purposes of the Defense Reinvestment and Conversion Program and the National IVHS Program simultaneously.

Priority corridors.—Four priority corridors have been designated by DOT based on criteria established in ISTEA: The I–95 Northeast priority corridor, the Midwest priority corridor, the Houston priority corridor, and the southern California priority corridor. Operational tests and other activities within these corridors will lead to their development as technical and institutional showcases for IVHS.

The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for the priority corridors program.

IVHS Program and system support.—The Committee recommends $11,500,000 for ITS program and systems support. Within the funds provided, training activities shall receive substantial priority over any outreach activities. The Committee directs that the total amount of GOE funds spent on institutional studies be less than $2,500,000.

The Committee requests the FHWA and FTA Administrators and the Director of the Joint Program Office [JPO] to submit before October 1, 1996, a letter to both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees detailing and quantifying the amount of Federal dollars that have been used to advance projects using ITS technologies. The documentation supporting this analysis should delineate the nature of the technologies deployed or tested. The letter should relate the specific amount of funds expended for ITS deployment activities to specific early deployment studies that were sponsored by the FHWA and to evaluate whether the ITS champion program and the expert network activity is worth continuing in light of the findings of this study.

The Committee appreciates the challenge of establishing the entire complex of standards needed to ensure compatible or interoperable ITS systems. A great deal of work already has been expended by FHWA, the ITS AMERICA Standards and Protocols Committee, and various standards development organizations to identify, catalog, and advance standards useful for the national ITS program. Despite these activities, considerably more work is required to reach agreement on all of the standards needed for a successful national ITS program.

Title VI of the ISTEA states that the Secretary shall develop and implement standards and protocols to promote the widespread use

of ITS technology. Thus far, DOT has been reluctant to use this authority for a variety of reasons. The Department should rethink how it can strengthen and further underpin the standards-setting process. For example, the Committee urges the Department, in cooperation with ITS AMERICA and the standards-setting community, to take the necessary steps, when appropriate, to accelerate the issuance of consensus standards related to message sets and protocols, ATMS interface standards, and location referencing standards. The Committee is concerned that without DOT assuming a more vigorous role, interoperability in ITS systems cannot be assured. The Department should be prepared to report substantially more progress leading toward consensus agreement and issuance of needed standards before next year's markup, especially if continued support of the ITS program is expected.

Incident management.—The costs of congestion to the Nation are often estimated at over $100,000,000,000 per year. Various FHWA-sponsored studies indicate that about 60 percent of nonrecurring congestion is caused by incidents such as vehicle crashes and breakdowns. Within the fiscal year 1996 request for ITS, FHWA intended to fund approximately $400,000 in the area of incident management and within the request for technology assessment and deployment, FHWA intended to fund $100,000 to advance this strategy.

The Committee questions whether the scope of these activities and amount of funds being allocated to incident management is adequate relative to the costs of congestion. FHWA should intensify its involvement in incident management, which is a key congestion management strategy, and is also viewed as a central part of the ITS core infrastructure. The Committee directs that $1,400,000 be used to investigate and deploy better methods of incident detection and other incident management technologies and practices, develop case studies of model incident management programs, facilitate technology transfer among jurisdictions implementing incident management programs, and most importantly, provide sufficient information and guidance to convince State and local officials that an effective incident management program is a significant tool for reducing nonrecurring congestion.

Joint Program Office.—The Committee agrees with the House that stronger steps must be taken to ensure a more cost conscious and strategically focused program. Consequently, the Committee directs the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs to empower the Joint Program Office [JPO] to: (1) exercise more vigorous control over the entire ITS budget, (2) review and monitor specific project objectives, costs, and schedules to accomplish JPO-approved program milestones, and (3) submit as part of the GOE budget a consolidated ITS program budget in fiscal year 1997 including the FTA, NHTSA, RSPA, and FHWA components of the program. The Committee suggests that these additional measures will increase the likelihood that the next GAO or inspector general review of the program will be more favorable than previous reports. The Committee expects the JPO to continue to monitor the specific costs and schedule performance of all active ITS projects. This ongoing process will ensure that the JPO exer-

cises more stringent fiscal and strategic control over the ITS program.

The Committee wants to ensure that ITS-related reports that result from the expenditure of public funds are entered promptly into the National Technical Information Service. The Director of the JPO working with each of the modal administrations is expected to ensure that this objective is achieved.

LONG TERM PAVEMENT PERFORMANCE [LTPP]

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,500,000 for the LTPP Program, which will be supplemented by $6,000,000 of ISTEA contract moneys. The program is of fundamental importance in evaluating the impact of traffic loads, environment, and maintenance strategies on the Nation's highway system. Well over $100,000,000 has been invested in constructing test sections and developing a practical and usable data base.

The program is a cooperative effort with all 50 States and every Canadian province as active participants. Nearly 1,000 sites with over 2,000 test sections are in the LTPP Program. All test sections were nominated by State and provincial participants to represent typical, local pavement types and environmental conditions, and to provide a statistically sound test matrix which represented all of the significant variables in the experiment. Each of these sites represents considerable investment of local resources as their portion of sharing the program costs. The LTPP Program is now ready to begin to deliver the pavement performance analysis for which it was created. The data and global analysis will provide participating agencies the ability to: (1) improve the design guides; (2) compare performance and select among various pavement design options; (3) improve tools and predictive models for pavement management decisions; and (4) provide sound technical data for wide ranging policy decisions. The funds provided will maintain the performance data collection activities and conduct the critical analysis work.

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT AND DEPLOYMENT

The Committee recommends $14,622,000 for technology assessment and deployment. The Committee directs that not less than $3,050,000 of these funds will be allocated toward safety activities (excluding congestion and incident management) and not less than $2,400,000 of the section 6005 funds shall be allocated toward safety applications. The Committee supports the priority technologies initiative funded under the section 6005 program.

For many years, the Office of Technology Applications [OTA] has consistently demonstrated a record of accomplishments and considerable cost effectiveness in its operations. Because of foreseeable budgetary limitations, the OTA needs to explore with industry a variety of new approaches to leverage better the funding of its technology transfer projects. The Committee requests OTA to work diligently with the private sector to increase the non-Federal contributions to those activities that are of direct benefit to commercial entities. OTA will deploy as soon as possible a strategy to accomplish this objective.

OTA is requested to detail by letter to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before January 1, 1997, the scope and nature of the current and planned strategies and activities to implement the objective of increased leveraging and cost sharing. To the extent possible, OTA will provide quantitative data and qualitative assessments that will demonstrate the extent to which it was successful in accomplishing this objective. The Committee will carefully consider the success of these efforts in future funding decisions regarding the OTA program.

The Committee has reviewed and is pleased with the response of the OTA to previous directives of the Committee to expedite innovations to promote motor carrier safety. The Committee expects OTA to continue providing such assistance to the Office of Motor Carriers.

In special report No. 244 to the FHWA, the Transportation Research Board [TRB] concluded that the entire highway industry needs to address attitudes and practices that stifle innovation. In light of the TRB findings, the OTA should vigorously work toward completion of action plans or marketing approaches to create an improved environment for technical change and quicker application of the products of research. OTA should incorporate such strategies into its projects and other actions to reduce barriers to innovation. Furthermore, before next year's hearing, the FHWA is requested to submit a letter to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations specifying the initial results of the FHWA/AASHTO/NCHRP study entitled "Facilitating the Implementation of Research Findings" and subsequent followup actions to be taken by FHWA and the highway community.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY INSTITUTE

The Committee recommends $4,369,000 for the National Highway Institute [NHI], the amount requested. NHI has developed a series of courses to further training, important to the National IVHS Program. The Committee expects the NHI to ensure that a good portion of the moneys provided herein will be used to complete the development of these courses and to start their delivery as soon as possible.

LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Committee believes that the Local Technical Assistance Program centers [LTAP], should play an increased role by serving as depositories of NHTSA documents and materials dealing with highway safety. This function is consistent with the legislative mandate regarding LTAP centers to enhance programs for the movement of passenger and freight. To this end, FHWA shall work with NHTSA to provide to each of the LTAP centers training materials and various publications designed to benefit State and local officials dealing with highway safety, including driver behavior challenges. In close cooperation with the National Association of Governors' Highway Safety Representatives, FHWA and NHTSA shall jointly issue a memorandum to the LTAP centers suggesting ways that these centers could benefit the broader highway safety community. The feasibility of providing NHTSA-sponsored training courses through

the centers should be explored. This will be especially important in assisting States with the Safer Communities Program, a new initiative funded under the section 402 program. Increased coordination among the LTAP centers, the Governors' Highway Safety Representatives, and the NHTSA regional offices should be encouraged. In their annual work plan statements which will be reviewed by FHWA, each of the LTAP centers shall detail how the information and training needs of the broader highway safety community would be strengthened.

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA] of 1991 greatly expanded the audience to be served by the Local Technical Assistance Program [LTAP]. In addition to serving governments in small and rural areas, the technical assistance program was mandated by section 6004 of ISTEA to provide training and technical assistance to urban areas in the populations range of 60,000 to 1 million. ISTEA also mandated the creation of a minimum of two technology transfer centers to serve American Indian tribal governments. This has greatly expanded the LTAP audience, which must now address over 38,000 counties, cities, and towns and over 540 tribal governments.

INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES

The Committees recommends $500,000 for the International Transportation Activities Program. The Committee encourages FHWA to redouble its efforts to find supplemental funding to help accomplish the objectives of this program.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR RUSSIA

The Committee recommends $400,000 for technical assistance for Russia and expects that a proportionate amount of these funds will be provided to other countries formerly part of the U.S.S.R.

OJT SUPPORT SERVICES

Funding originally authorized by 23 U.S.C. 140(b) was intended to increase the effectiveness of on-the-job [OJT] efforts in highway construction crafts in which minorities, including women, were underrepresented. State managers have been reluctant to divert funding from the basic construction program to training. Consequently, minorities have been hired for the more marginal jobs. The Committee has included the $5,000,000 requested by the administration for the necessary coordinated recruitment and training efforts.

TRUCK DYNAMIC TEST FACILITY

FHWA has signed a partnership agreement that will allow the Agency to have access to a non-Federal test facility. In light of this cost-saving arrangement, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $750,000, which is 50 percent of the administration's request.

COST ALLOCATION STUDY (TRUCK SIZE AND WEIGHT)

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the truck size and weight and cost allocation studies. The Committee maintains that FHWA should reduce the number and scope of the topics proposed for examination in the truck size and weight study, and focus on those items most likely to be debated during reauthorization of the highway program. FHWA must ensure that these studies are available for consideration during the upcoming debate on highway reauthorization. FHWA indicated that approximately $8,000,000 will be required to complete both studies. With the $1,100,000 of fiscal year 1995 policy research funds that have been applied to these studies, the Committee believes that the total amount of funds recommended will be more than sufficient. The Committee directs the FHWA to complete a major portion of the cost-allocation study before completing phase III of the truck size and weight study. FHWA must ensure that policy decisions on truck size and weight should be formulated within the context of well reasoned cost-allocation decisions which ensure that each vehicle class, and each distinct vehicle type within those classes, fairly shoulders its cost responsibilities for infrastructure damage and other societal impacts.

The Committee denies the full amount requested because of budgetary limitations and because several organizations, including the GAO, TRB, AASHTO, and others, have already conducted a variety of truck size and weight studies, primarily focusing on infrastructure concerns. Nevertheless, with the funds provided, FHWA must conduct thoroughly objective and comprehensive studies on truck size and weight and cost allocation issues examining not only on infrastructure concerns but safety and associated crash cost impacts, congestion and capacity effects, and energy and environmental concerns. Also, given the wide intermodal implications of cost allocation and truck size and weight policy, both studies must involve representatives from the Office of the Secretary as well as other modal administrations to ensure a balanced interagency perspective. The Committee directs that, to the maximum extent possible, FHWA shall ensure that the contractors participating in these studies are free from conflicts of interest with the trucking and rail industries.

FHWA is expected to complete these analyses with fiscal year 1996 funds. FHWA is provided the flexibility to use funds for policy research to complete these studies, but the amount of fiscal year 1996 section 6005 funds allocated for policy studies shall not be more than $1,800,000, the same as that planned for allocation during fiscal year 1995.

GOE BUDGET JUSTIFICATION, RESEARCH PRIORITIES, AND PLANNING

The Committee has appreciated the level of detail and thorough justification that has historically characterized the GOE budget request of the FHWA. The Committee found that the fiscal year 1996 budget submittal did not provide a comprehensive and analytical framework for understanding the intended uses of moneys derived from the Federal highway trust fund. Simply stated, the fiscal year 1996 budget justification did not meet the quality of presentation set by past budgets. In addition, FHWA must be certain that its

budget submittal contains its most current R&D objectives and planned projects. The fiscal year 1996 submittal did not meet this standard in every research category.

The Committee has reviewed the Transportation Research Board [TRB] report entitled "Highway Research: Current Programs and Future Directions." The Committee expects FHWA to consider carefully the TRB recommendations dealing with the importance of pursuing additional exploratory and high-risk research. The Committee wants to be convinced that FHWA has properly balanced RD&T activities aimed at attaining longer-term objectives with shorter-term payoffs. FHWA will be asked to estimate next year the amount of funds in each RD&T program activity that will be devoted to longer-range research. Also, FHWA should provide the Research and Technology Coordinating Committee [RTCC] of TRB with the opportunity to comment on the RD&T budget request each year before it is submitted to OMB.

For many years, FHWA prepared a 5-year strategic plan to help guide the RD&T program. In view of the prospects for reorganization at the Department, FHWA did not produce such a plan for the fiscal year 1995–2000 or later periods. In light of foreseeable budgetary constraints, such strategic planning is even more critical because the Committee must be convinced that the wisest choices for RD&T funding have been made by FHWA within the context of a strategic plan. Consequently, the Committee directs that FHWA immediately reinstitute its 5-year strategic planning exercise and expects to receive an updated plan each year comparable in quality to previous 5-year strategic plans issued by FHWA. The first of these new plans should be submitted to both the House and Senate Committees concurrently with the fiscal year 1997 budget request. The plan should assume several scenarios in its formulation based on different budget projections. The Committee supports periodic fundamental or zero-base reviews by the Research and Technology Executive Board. The results of these analyses should be included in forthcoming 5-year strategic plans.

The Committee seeks a more definitive accounting of all administrative expenses associated with the RD&T program, including costs associated with research management and coordination, and operation of the Turner Fairbanks facility. The Committee directs FHWA to prepare a report detailing all such expenses (other than P, C, and B) for fiscal years 1994, 1995, 1996, and planned for fiscal year 1997. These expenses will include all costs derived from the administrative takedown out of the LGOE program accounts as well any other funds. This report will be submitted to both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations concurrent with the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

The Committee is concerned that the management and coordination costs of the RD&T budget are excessive—about $12,400,000 during fiscal year 1995. These expenses, some of which are necessary, reduce the amount of funds available for actual technological progress. Consequently, the Committee directs that no more than $9,900,000 be derived from the administrative takedown of the RD&T programmatic funds to support research management and coordination. FHWA should explore mechanisms to further reduce these costs and more accurately display these costs, for exam-

ple, registration costs for annual meetings should be accounted for in the budget set aside for training.

OTHER

University parkway, Jackson, MS.—The Committee is aware of efforts by the city of Jackson and Jackson State University to implement plans for a university parkway to connect the University to Jackson's central business district and provide intermodal transportation linkage with the area's highways, light and major rail connections, and airport access. This project, which is located within a federally designated enterprise community, will provide a means to revitalize the area surrounding Jackson State University, one of the Nation's historically black colleges and universities. The Committee notes that the Mississippi Legislature has committed $20,000,000 from the State, Hinds County, and the city for use with Federal funds for the university parkway. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department of Transportation to review this project's eligibility under the Department's programs and provide such assistance as may be appropriate.

South Louisiana hurricane evacuation high-priority corridors.—The Committee is aware of the hurricane evacuation needs in south Louisiana and expects the Federal Highway Administration to identify routes that will expedite future emergency evacuations of coastal areas of Louisiana that could be considered as high-priority corridors.

Shiloh interchange.—The Committee understands that an additional $3,000,000 may be needed for the Shiloh interchange in Billings, MT. The Committee urges the authorizing committee to determine if this additional funding is necessary and take appropriate actions in authorizing these funds.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Verrazano-Narrows Bridge.—The Committee has retained language in the bill continuing the one-way westbound toll collection system on the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge. The Committee believes one-way westbound tolls reduce traffic congestion and pollution, and encourages the Governors of New York and New Jersey to agree upon a mutually acceptable solution to the problem of toll collection without increasing pollution and congestion. The Committee has repeated the bill language on this subject which was contained in Public Law 103–122.

Obligation rates.—The Committee has continued language which limits Federal-aid highways first quarter obligations and changed the amount to 12 percent of the total.

General operating expenses.—The Committee has included bill language which it has in previous bills that clarifies those activities, programs, and projects that are to be included under the "Limitation on general operating expenses" account.

Recycled paving material.—The Committee has included House language delaying the administration, implementation, and enforcement of section 1038(d) of Public Law 102–240.

Metric signage.—In 1988, Congress enacted legislation that required all Federal agencies to incorporate metric measurements in

their grant and procurement programs; the legislation was subsequently reinforced by a 1991 Executive order that required all agencies to develop a conversion plan. The FHWA plan was approved by the Secretary of Transportation in October 1991. In June 1994, the FHWA published a notice of agency decision in the Federal Register that summarized the responses to an FHWA notice titled "Options for Coordinating the Metric Conversion of Traffic Control Signs," and announced the Agency's decision to delay implementation of any national metric sign conversion until after 1996, or until further indication of the intention of Congress on this subject. The Committee has included House language which does not allow Federal funds to be used for metric signage.

Miller Highway.—The Committee has deleted House language restricting the use of funds for this project in New York City, NY.

HIGHWAY-RELATED SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	($10,800,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(10,000,000)
House allowance	(10,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(13,000,000)

Section 402 of title 23, United States Code, authorizes programs to assist States and localities in implementing highway safety programs in accordance with uniform standards established by the Secretary. Most of the activities carried out under the FHWA standards involve development and implementation of systems, procedures, manuals, et cetera, to assist highway agencies in the orderly planning and implementation of safety construction and operational improvements.

The Committee recommends $13,000,000 for liquidation of contract authority for highway-related safety grants.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The Committee recommends $13,000,000 for a limitation on obligations of contract authority for highway-related safety grants, which is $3,000,000 above the President's request. These additional funds will enhance the States' efforts to refine and implement safety management systems, to allow States to pass through moneys to local governments to provide highway engineering expertise as part of the Safer Communities Program, or to conduct highway outreach campaigns that deal with traffic signalization, markings, work-zone safety, and other engineering concerns.

OFFICE OF HIGHWAY SAFETY

The Committee is impressed with the revitalization of the Office of Highway Safety. In response to a directive of the Committee, this Office has submitted an excellent 5-year strategic plan outlining its future course and direction. The Office continues to improve its outreach activities, has implemented a new training course on hazardous materials routing, is working with local communities to help close grade crossings pursuant to section 1010 of the ISTEA,

has made substantial progress in getting the States to remove unsafe guard rails, and is beginning to pursue a new pedestrian safety initiative with NHTSA. The Committee highly approves of the increased flexibility that this Office is providing the States in implementing the section 402 program. The Committee looks forward to reviewing the accomplishments of this Office as part of next year's hearing.

Within the funds provided for technology assessment and deployment, the Committee recommends that not less than $1,000,000 shall be allocated to the Office of Highway Safety [OHS] to develop and pilot test at least two new outreach campaigns that can be used by the States under the section 402 program. The Committee has reviewed the Red Light Running Campaign and has received positive comments on this program from various State officials. The Committee expects that the OHS will develop other successful highway safety outreach activities, such as a project to increase compliance with yield right-of-way or grade crossings signs. These campaigns should be ready for deployment by the States, if they so chose, as part of their fiscal year 1997 section 402 programs.

The Committee strongly endorses the initial actions taken to implement the Department's grade crossing plan. The Department should submit a letter to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before next year's hearing detailing steps taken to complete implementation of this plan and the resulting progress. The Committee supports and encourages the work of FHWA, FRA, and affected States to promote the elimination of grade crossings involving principal rail lines that cross the proposed National Highway System.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	($17,000,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996[1]	(19,200,000,000)
House allowance	(19,200,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(19,200,000,000)

[1] This account is proposed to be replaced by funding through the Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP].

This activity comprises the majority of all federally aided programs through which the States are financially and technically aided to continue a national highway system that meets the transportation needs of the Nation in terms of capacity and safety.

All programs included within the Federal-aid account are financed from the highway trust fund. Authorizations in the form of contract authority have been enacted in substantive legislation. Except for interstate construction, these authorizations are apportioned and/or allocated to the States and generally remain available for obligation over a 4-year period. Liquidating cash appropriations are subsequently requested to fund outlays resulting from obligations incurred under contract authority.

The Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of $19,200,000,000 for the Federal-aid highways program, which is the same as the House allowance and the administration's request.

OBLIGATION CEILING

Funding for Federal-aid highways is proposed in the administration's budget to cover only authorized demonstration projects continuing in fiscal year 1996 and thereafter with spending controlled by an obligation limitation of $200,000,000. Under the administration's proposal, the balance of programs formerly included in this account are replaced by funding through the new UTIIP.

Under the House's allowance, which includes an obligation ceiling of $18,000,000,000 it is estimated that programs exempt from the limitation would total approximately $2,311,932,000 for a total program level of $20,311,932,000.

The Committee recommends an obligation ceiling of $17,000,000,000 for the regular Federal-aid formula program. In addition, the programs outside the obligation ceiling are estimated at $2,333,591,000 for a total program level of $19,333,591,000.

Estimated fiscal year 1996 obligation limitation distributed at $17,000,000,000

State	*Current law*
Alabama	$255,529,041
Alaska	205,712,234
Arizona	188,031,345
Arkansas	156,392,352
California	1,245,583,528
Colorado	180,808,628
Connecticut	314,295,517
Delaware	66,310,424
District of Columbia	86,151,135
Florida	501,381,024
Georgia	396,532,369
Hawaii	107,711,205
Idaho	113,241,109
Illinois	574,896,410
Indiana	295,647,613
Iowa	195,416,095
Kansas	183,721,178
Kentucky	216,621,399
Louisiana	235,168,149
Maine	80,370,851
Maryland	317,710,705
Massachusetts	707,804,315
Michigan	378,105,512
Minnesota	257,213,296
Mississippi	166,676,059
Missouri	316,288,041
Montana	156,140,489
Nebraska	126,060,246
Nevada	99,837,065
New Hampshire	76,462,258
New Jersey	479,429,326
New Mexico	170,122,763
New York	868,995,994
North Carolina	365,289,452
North Dakota	99,920,745
Ohio	555,354,305
Oklahoma	200,248,028
Oregon	191,723,048
Pennsylvania	798,383,405
Rhode Island	92,747,888
South Carolina	170,121,901
South Dakota	113,123,344
Tennessee	304,905,828
Texas	930,208,190
Utah	119,811,839

Estimated fiscal year 1996 obligation limitation distributed at $17,000,000,000—Continued

State	*Current law*
Vermont	71,079,171
Virginia	340,738,307
Washington	213,980,548
West Virginia	152,475,440
Wisconsin	262,391,771
Wyoming	103,456,660
Puerto Rico	73,062,754
Subtotal	14,879,390,299
Administration	573,704,000
Federal lands	448,000,000
Allocation reserve	1,098,905,701
Total	17,000,000,000

DONOR/DONEE STATE COMPARISON

There has been considerable debate regarding the donor/donee State issue as it regards the individual States' contributions into the highway trust fund and the amount of funding each State receives under the Federal-aid highways program. Congress created section 157, the minimum allocation program to correct any inequities created between contributions versus receipts. This program, however, is not based on a dollar-in versus dollar-out calculation. The minimum allocation formula is a ratio between a State's percent share contributed to the highway trust fund and the percent share the State receives from the trust fund in a given year. Under the program no State receives less than 85 percent of its percent share of the total amount contributed to the trust fund by all States versus its percent share received from the fund for the last year for which FHWA has data.

In effect, the minimum allocation makeup funds received by a State in fiscal year 1996 are based on fiscal year 1994 contributions and receipts. The minimum allocation program calculation only considers the last year for which FHWA has data, and no adjustments are made for contributions and receipts over the life of the Federal-aid highway program. This has resulted in some States receiving minimum allocation funding, which started in fiscal year 1988, even though that State has received more funding from the highway trust fund than it has contributed to the fund since the start of the Federal-aid highway program in 1956.

The following tables depict:

Table A.—Funds contributed to and received from the highway trust fund since its inception.

Table B.—Estimated fiscal year 1996 MA Program.

Table C.—Federal funds reduced pursuant to section 1003(C) of ISTEA.

TABLE A.—COMPARISON OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY TRUST FUND RECEIPTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE STATES AND FEDERAL-AID APPORTIONMENTS AND ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND—FISCAL YEARS 1957–94 [1]

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Payments into the fund [2]		Apportionments and allocations from the fund [3]		Ratio of apportionments and allocations to payments	
	Fiscal year 1994	Cumulated since July 1, 1956	Fiscal year 1994	Cumulated since July 1, 1956	Fiscal year 1994	Cumulated since July 1, 1956
Alabama	$311,650	$5,356,849	$353,096	$6,338,522	1.13	1.18
Alaska	46,919	555,115	231,125	3,918,609	4.93	7.06
Arizona	258,719	3,795,797	277,014	4,870,635	1.07	1.28
Arkansas	203,636	3,583,949	272,735	3,593,994	1.34	1.00
California	1,514,363	28,686,779	2,474,027	27,730,289	1.63	.97
Colorado	189,618	3,564,791	285,478	4,967,000	1.51	1.39
Connecticut	154,221	3,307,502	351,269	5,886,091	2.28	1.78
Delaware	41,508	824,835	78,950	1,262,099	1.90	1.53
District of Columbia	19,444	513,906	96,149	2,180,348	4.94	4.24
Florida	736,201	12,082,558	774,045	11,075,987	1.05	.92
Georgia	555,947	8,661,843	581,072	8,458,810	1.05	.98
Hawaii	37,200	710,159	289,736	2,920,270	7.79	4.11
Idaho	81,211	1,319,095	138,570	2,403,315	1.71	1.82
Illinois	571,867	11,806,168	769,367	13,347,691	1.35	1.13
Indiana	406,411	7,518,396	406,512	6,656,468	1.00	.89
Iowa	174,034	3,852,564	244,292	4,526,272	1.40	1.17
Kansas	169,880	3,544,745	203,033	4,012,817	1.20	1.13
Kentucky	294,879	4,691,721	274,465	5,289,012	.93	1.13
Louisiana	250,979	5,092,115	287,679	6,759,264	1.15	1.33
Maine	76,650	1,514,342	125,368	1,726,438	1.64	1.14
Maryland	252,997	4,864,984	364,846	7,543,367	1.44	1.55
Massachusetts	259,858	5,661,816	1,063,763	9,538,523	4.09	1.68
Michigan	519,444	10,363,710	584,226	9,457,588	1.12	.91
Minnesota	239,915	5,008,080	276,782	6,501,448	1.15	1.30
Mississippi	189,541	3,489,553	216,461	3,626,064	1.14	1.04
Missouri	378,536	7,184,783	393,724	7,062,549	1.04	.98

TABLE A.—COMPARISON OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY TRUST FUND RECEIPTS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE STATES AND FEDERAL-AID APPORTIONMENTS AND ALLOCATIONS FROM THE FUND—FISCAL YEARS 1957–94 [1]—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Payments into the fund [2]		Apportionments and allocations from the fund [3]		Ratio of apportionments and allocations to payments	
	Fiscal year 1994	Cumulated since July 1, 1956	Fiscal year 1994	Cumulated since July 1, 1956	Fiscal year 1994	Cumulated since July 1, 1956
Montana	68,715	1,342,504	175,992	3,349,148	2.56	2.49
Nebraska	112,666	2,262,884	159,987	2,712,071	1.42	1.20
Nevada	96,073	1,343,785	134,447	2,257,938	1.40	1.68
New Hampshire	55,986	1,069,824	93,232	1,565,880	1.67	1.46
New Jersey	352,062	8,164,660	528,651	8,453,836	1.50	1.04
New Mexico	125,161	2,168,912	199,507	3,099,838	1.59	1.43
New York	658,624	14,068,070	1,029,612	17,127,375	1.56	1.22
North Carolina	436,940	7,998,568	501,052	6,963,145	1.15	.87
North Dakota	51,624	1,021,649	122,145	2,006,162	2.37	1.96
Ohio	581,829	12,575,649	690,176	11,725,259	1.19	.93
Oklahoma	239,820	4,786,427	276,662	4,200,994	1.15	.88
Oregon	189,879	3,642,633	248,129	4,476,268	1.31	1.23
Pennsylvania	635,093	12,790,749	1,042,792	14,823,459	1.64	1.16
Rhode Island	40,051	908,368	122,737	2,059,549	3.06	2.27
South Carolina	251,662	4,230,696	337,016	3,961,288	1.34	.94
South Dakota	53,260	1,090,391	131,295	2,165,410	2.47	1.99
Tennessee	355,599	6,385,830	384,958	6,629,020	1.08	1.04
Texas	1,112,402	21,279,776	1,227,228	18,568,887	1.10	.87
Utah	109,301	1,904,994	157,066	3,396,851	1.44	1.78
Vermont	41,004	672,440	80,102	1,551,831	1.95	2.31
Virginia	402,678	6,977,994	534,322	8,475,890	1.33	1.21
Washington	270,454	5,032,061	656,074	8,444,435	2.43	1.68
West Virginia	117,085	2,269,163	222,147	4,763,969	1.90	2.10
Wisconsin	295,085	5,568,256	365,406	4,987,995	1.24	.90
Wyoming	71,318	1,132,791	137,245	2,306,434	1.92	2.04

Total	14,659,999	278,245,229	20,971,737	321,726,400	1.43	1.16
American Samoa	.....	.....	8,061	40,758	.....	.....
Guam	.....	.....	18,532	105,950	.....	.....
Northern Marianas	.....	.....	3,998	24,944	.....	.....
Puerto Rico	.....	.....	85,075	1,237,812	.....	.....
Virgin Islands	.....	.....	17,486	105,318	.....	.....
Grand total	14,659,999	278,245,229	21,104,889	323,241,184	1.44	1.16

[1] Payments into the fund include only the net tax receipts deposited in the highway account of the Federal highway trust fund. Excluded are motor fuel taxes transferred to the ''Mass transit'' account of the highway trust fund (1 cent per gallon from April 1, 1983 through November 30, 1990, 1.5 cents per gallon thereafter); the 0.1 cent per gallon tax dedicated to the leaking underground storage tank trust fund beginning January 1, 1987; and the tax designated for deficit reduction (2.5 cents per gallon from December 1, 1990 through September 30, 1993, 6.8 cents thereafter); and the tax from motorboat use of gasoline transferred to the aquatic resources trust fund and the land and water conservation fund. Apportionments include fiscal year 1995 interstate construction funds apportioned during fiscal year 1994.

[2] Total Federal highway trust fund receipts are reported by the U.S. Department of the Treasury. Payments into the highway trust fund attributable to highway users in each State are estimated by the Federal Highway Administration. Includes revenues from highway-user taxes only. Payments into the fund are understated by $1,590,000,000 due to an error by the Treasury Department in reconciling estimated deposits to the actual tax revenue. The $1,590,000,000 was credited to the fund in fiscal year 1995. Had the funds been credited timely, the national ratio of apportionments and allocations to payments would have been 1.30.

[3] Includes all funds apportioned or allocated from the highway trust fund except for the following programs: Indian reservation roads, highway safety information, and local transportation assistance. These programs are either administered by other Federal agencies or are treated as administrative funds and cannot be easily attributed to individual States. Obligations are used to represent allocations for the following programs: Federal lands, rural highway public transportation demonstration, parkways and park roads, and alcohol safety incentive grants.

TABLE B.—ESTIMATED FISCAL YEAR 1996 MINIMUM ALLOCATION PROGRAM

State	Unobligated balance as of June 30, 1995	Estimated fiscal year 1996—			Total
		Minimum allocation	Available minimum allocation before reduction	Minimum allocation reduction section 1003(c)	
Alabama	$17,899,158	$30,659,980	$48,559,138	$5,922,174	$42,636,965
Alaska	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Arizona	61,345,150	56,381,095	117,726,245	10,890,374	106,835,871
Arkansas	39,819,410	42,639,342	82,458,752	8,236,065	74,222,687
California	392,305,532	321,283,318	713,588,850	62,057,954	651,530,896
Colorado	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Connecticut	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Delaware	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
District of Columbia	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Florida	49,503,957	205,227,242	254,731,199	39,640,971	215,090,228

TABLE B.—ESTIMATED FISCAL YEAR 1996 MINIMUM ALLOCATION PROGRAM—Continued

State	Unobligated balance as of June 30, 1995	Estimated fiscal year 1996—			
		Minimum allocation	Available minimum allocation before reduction	Minimum allocation reduction section 1003(c)	Total
Georgia	190,080,830	96,065,341	286,146,171	18,555,643	267,590,529
Hawaii	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Idaho	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Illinois	6,852	.....	6,852	.....	6,852
Indiana	25,016,867	75,625,592	100,642,459	14,607,573	86,034,887
Iowa	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kansas	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Kentucky	65,648,363	46,545,760	112,194,123	8,990,615	103,203,508
Louisiana	2,749,481	2,874,052	5,623,533	555,142	5,068,391
Maine	87,462	.....	87,462	.....	87,462
Maryland	11,172,841	.....	11,172,841	.....	11,172,841
Massachusetts	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Michigan	23,972,451	80,892,559	104,865,010	15,624,922	89,240,088
Minnesota	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mississippi	6,444,159	22,288,208	28,732,367	4,305,112	24,427,255
Missouri	43,076,567	51,055,638	94,132,205	9,861,727	84,270,478
Montana	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nebraska	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nevada	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Hampshire	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Jersey	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New Mexico	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
New York	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
North Carolina	51,649,782	72,205,409	123,855,191	13,946,942	109,908,249
North Dakota	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Ohio	120,211,860	48,662,045	168,873,905	9,399,389	159,474,516
Oklahoma	28,183,057	31,909,613	60,092,670	6,163,548	53,929,121
Oregon	12,668,869	.....	12,668,869	.....	12,668,869
Pennsylvania	5,257,269	.....	5,257,269	.....	5,257,269

Rhode Island	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
South Carolina	20,467,942	.....	20,467,942	.....	20,467,942
South Dakota	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Tennessee	48,654,373	36,875,219	85,529,592	7,122,687	78,406,905
Texas	153,895,442	144,526,798	298,422,240	27,916,287	270,505,953
Utah	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Vermont	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Virginia	73,675,198	.....	73,675,198	.....	73,675,198
Washington	9,589,941	.....	9,589,941	.....	9,589,941
West Virginia	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wisconsin	13,332,797	61,105,252	74,438,049	11,802,875	62,635,174
Wyoming	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Puerto Rico	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	1,466,715,609	1,426,822,463	2,893,538,072	275,600,000	2,617,938,072

Note: With exception to column 1, these amounts are estimates. The amounts will change when the apportionment and allocation are made.

TABLE C.—ESTIMATED REDUCED AMOUNTS PER SECTION 1003(C) OF PUBLIC LAW 102–240

States	Interstate reimbursement	Interstate maintenance	National Highway System	Bridge	Surface Transportation Program	Congestion mitigation air/quality
Alabama	$1,925,000	$10,685,974	$13,450,665	$8,450,507	$16,824,154	$994,933
Alaska	1,925,000	4,319,187	10,902,745	1,773,523	23,137,409	980,009
Arizona	1,925,000	12,033,931	9,246,632	1,323,485	11,488,734	2,668,600
Arkansas	1,925,000	6,192,687	8,056,388	5,822,105	9,590,170	994,933
California	20,864,588	53,827,440	58,034,017	34,661,074	68,307,543	29,898,106
Colorado	1,925,000	10,293,430	10,833,741	5,139,199	13,735,635	980,009
Connecticut	21,980,959	7,113,123	11,730,802	10,553,419	20,541,373	4,676,092
Delaware	2,733,184	2,820,300	3,519,241	1,336,854	5,319,299	980,009
District of Columbia	1,925,000	2,820,300	3,712,944	2,964,660	4,177,639	994,933
Florida	2,155,751	21,233,239	27,601,886	9,618,880	42,879,715	6,032,742
Georgia	3,233,626	20,162,008	20,246,054	8,949,274	25,040,262	3,124,309
Hawaii	1,925,000	2,820,300	3,588,245	4,051,148	13,035,595	980,009
Idaho	1,925,000	5,198,259	5,382,368	1,412,106	7,854,484	980,009
Illinois	33,183,164	19,443,753	26,773,830	19,242,032	33,698,272	9,737,830
Indiana	11,664,152	12,595,137	15,043,028	7,176,980	20,787,848	2,239,459
Iowa	1,925,000	7,820,039	10,833,741	8,130,276	13,270,892	980,009
Kansas	7,083,181	8,011,250	9,867,674	8,190,786	10,438,446	980,009
Kentucky	2,194,246	9,760,068	11,385,778	6,887,899	14,101,382	1,461,399
Louisiana	1,925,000	10,091,011	11,629,221	12,369,453	8,668,273	994,933
Maine	2,656,193	2,820,300	4,347,297	3,587,175	5,323,625	980,009
Maryland	10,740,258	9,300,365	10,998,721	7,762,522	12,422,411	6,263,337
Massachusetts	19,786,713	9,529,792	13,110,896	23,252,006	3,126,279	8,184,610
Michigan	15,937,158	18,320,933	19,615,554	14,330,275	19,787,367	5,869,854
Minnesota	1,925,000	10,776,149	12,006,821	5,318,188	16,218,789	980,009
Mississippi	1,925,000	6,730,216	8,756,944	7,695,379	9,007,357	994,933
Missouri	5,196,899	15,111,180	17,093,554	17,759,248	13,055,178	2,001,756
Montana	1,925,000	8,776,916	7,590,519	2,354,057	9,287,173	980,009
Nebraska	1,925,000	4,556,003	7,495,944	5,431,372	10,070,605	994,933
Nevada	1,925,000	4,965,939	5,394,277	1,323,485	8,108,747	994,933

TABLE C.—ESTIMATED REDUCED AMOUNTS PER SECTION 1003(C) OF PUBLIC LAW 102–240—Continued

States	Donor State bonus	Apportionment adjustment	Subtotal	Minimum allocation	Demonstration projects	Total
Alabama	$5,026,558	$357,935	$57,715,727	$5,922,174	$5,884,804	$69,522,704
Alaska	.....	5,632,043	48,669,917	.....	.....	48,669,917
Arizona	1,610,645	3,951,310	44,248,337	10,890,374	454,000	55,592,711
Arkansas	1,967,513	2,964,017	37,512,813	8,236,065	12,672,724	58,421,602
California	10,194,090	.....	275,786,858	62,057,954	13,501,686	351,346,498
Colorado	.....	.....	42,907,014	.....	107,918	43,014,932
Connecticut	.....	.....	76,595,767	.....	2,954,719	79,550,487
Delaware	.....	1,015,451	17,724,338	.....	.....	17,724,338
District of Columbia	.....	825,017	17,420,495	.....	822,409	18,242,904
Florida	5,142,394	408,190	115,072,796	39,640,971	6,681,982	161,395,750
Georgia	4,146,099	3,672,069	88,573,701	18,555,643	4,130,206	111,259,550
Hawaii	.....	.....	26,400,298	.....	223,279	26,623,577
Idaho	.....	4,768,594	27,520,820	.....	2,619,801	30,140,622
Illinois	.....	20,666,136	162,745,018	.....	9,334,159	172,079,177
Indiana	9,292,189	.....	78,798,793	14,607,573	3,531,522	96,937,888
Iowa	.....	3,494,447	46,454,403	.....	4,232,133	50,686,536
Kansas	.....	4,325,617	48,896,963	.....	2,716,556	51,613,519
Kentucky	5,746,363	.....	51,537,135	8,990,615	803,803	61,331,553
Louisiana	2,402,865	7,187,037	55,267,792	555,142	2,603,614	58,426,548
Maine	.....	1,187,241	20,901,841	.....	6,962,569	27,864,410
Maryland	.....	.....	57,487,614	.....	3,576,178	61,063,792
Massachusetts	.....	4,720,583	81,710,879	.....	219,557	81,930,436
Michigan	7,613,106	.....	101,474,247	15,624,922	4,616,656	121,715,824
Minnesota	.....	12,766,617	59,991,574	.....	7,767,860	67,759,434
Mississippi	1,515,048	3,267,038	39,891,915	4,305,112	1,228,962	45,425,989
Missouri	5,265,110	1,720,647	77,203,571	9,861,727	5,361,401	92,426,699
Montana	.....	6,363,578	37,277,252	.....	669,836	37,947,088
Nebraska	.....	205,345	30,679,202	.....	931,071	31,610,274
Nevada	.....	1,823,046	24,535,427	.....	3,365,147	27,900,574

TABLE C.—ESTIMATED REDUCED AMOUNTS PER SECTION 1003(C) OF PUBLIC LAW 102–240—Continued

States	Interstate reimbursement	Interstate maintenance	National Highway System	Bridge	Surface Transportation Program	Congestion mitigation air/quality
New Hampshire	1,925,000	2,820,300	4,209,288	2,708,199	5,839,170	980,009
New Jersey	24,675,647	6,130,994	18,284,498	27,577,423	15,656,798	11,638,640
New Mexico	1,925,000	9,062,561	7,383,505	1,659,068	9,128,518	980,009
New York	64,980,488	20,446,145	38,250,330	52,939,412	29,210,303	21,236,474
North Carolina	2,502,211	11,822,875	17,724,054	14,122,965	21,483,921	994,933
North Dakota	1,925,000	4,307,369	5,175,354	1,323,485	8,271,863	980,009
Ohio	18,015,917	21,393,241	24,979,707	21,044,860	25,222,268	8,123,719
Oklahoma	6,390,261	7,664,031	10,557,721	8,301,429	12,520,519	980,009
Oregon	5,466,368	8,536,553	8,616,833	7,692,467	6,814,917	1,183,391
Pennsylvania	24,752,638	14,889,909	28,792,831	53,474,153	9,518,467	12,196,973
Rhode Island	1,925,000	2,820,300	3,588,245	3,433,439	4,371,953	1,163,707
South Carolina	1,925,000	9,635,020	10,212,698	6,012,700	11,875,622	980,009
South Dakota	1,925,000	5,195,746	5,727,391	1,984,487	8,220,831	980,009
Tennessee	1,925,000	13,889,750	15,412,221	11,194,761	16,231,619	1,761,349
Texas	14,012,380	42,415,104	47,777,884	21,938,198	63,275,578	20,051,387
Utah	1,925,000	9,413,604	6,555,448	2,271,736	5,967,373	980,009
Vermont	1,925,000	2,820,300	3,795,259	2,901,615	4,544,990	980,009
Virginia	7,737,605	15,708,156	15,342,165	10,105,866	15,280,005	4,295,925
Washington	5,081,413	12,194,969	12,329,777	12,579,675	8,212,777	3,209,678
West Virginia	1,925,000	4,535,081	8,616,833	11,099,042	7,581,438	994,933
Wisconsin	1,925,000	7,642,686	11,592,792	6,294,549	17,269,182	2,493,658
Wyoming	1,925,000	6,932,803	5,727,391	1,323,485	7,141,654	980,009
Puerto Rico	.....	2,538,270	4,098,250	3,027,118	5,728,078	994,933
Total	385,000,000	560,945,000	693,000,000	531,877,500	788,672,500	198,082,500

TABLE C.—ESTIMATED REDUCED AMOUNTS PER SECTION 1003(C) OF PUBLIC LAW 102–240—Continued

States	Donor State bonus	Apportionment adjustment	Subtotal	Minimum allocation	Demonstration projects	Total
New Hampshire	.....	790,078	19,272,044	.....	1,194,540	20,466,584
New Jersey	.....	10,598,270	114,562,271	.....	7,550,536	122,112,806
New Mexico	.....	10,202,468	40,341,129	.....	401,901	40,743,030
New York	.....	17,429,241	244,492,393	.....	13,278,747	257,771,140
North Carolina	3,236,125	9,880,713	81,767,797	13,946,942	5,440,554	101,155,293
North Dakota	.....	2,564,152	24,547,233	.....	2,642,129	27,189,362
Ohio	16,036,592	4,834,103	139,650,407	9,399,389	5,885,622	154,935,419
Oklahoma	1,775,029	3,749,826	51,938,826	6,163,548	3,294,847	61,397,221
Oregon	.....	5,520,917	43,831,446	.....	1,711,802	45,543,248
Pennsylvania	.....	.....	143,624,970	.....	32,811,153	176,436,123
Rhode Island	.....	.....	17,302,644	.....	2,136,403	19,439,048
South Carolina	.....	.....	40,641,049	.....	1,440,147	42,081,196
South Dakota	.....	3,510,683	27,544,148	.....	696,629	28,240,777
Tennessee	4,477,812	3,960,530	68,853,041	7,122,687	1,536,677	77,512,406
Texas	9,816,983	.....	219,287,515	27,916,287	9,029,950	256,233,751
Utah	.....	1,904,044	29,017,215	.....	405,623	29,422,838
Vermont	.....	1,067,786	18,034,959	.....	744,262	18,779,221
Virginia	.....	.....	68,469,723	.....	5,191,226	73,660,949
Washington	.....	.....	53,608,288	.....	3,334,293	56,942,581
West Virginia	.....	2,021,404	36,773,730	.....	11,603,041	48,376,771
Wisconsin	3,680,479	10,332,768	61,231,114	11,802,875	2,660,736	75,694,725
Wyoming	.....	1,343,445	25,373,788	.....	744,262	26,118,050
Puerto Rico	.....	.....	16,386,650	.....	.....	16,386,650
Total	98,945,000	181,032,386	3,437,554,886	275,600,000	221,709,632	3,934,864,518
Administration	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	133,455,000
Total	.....	.....	.....	.....	221,709,632	4,068,319,518

SECTION 1003(C) REDUCTIONS IN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR BUDGET COMPLIANCE

The Committee has included two general provisions to alleviate the reduction in budget authority carried out by section 1003(c) of Public Law 102–240. That provision has effectively reduced the amount of new contract authority that each State would receive in fiscal year 1996 by approximately 20 percent. The Committee feels that States should be allowed flexibility on how to administer the cut and has included bill language which: (*a*) permits a State to exchange accrued unobligated contract authority balances from prior years for additional fiscal year 1996 contract authority; and (*b*) permits a State, for fiscal year 1996, to exchange demonstration project unobligated contract authorizations or unobligated appropriations on a dollar-for-dollar basis, provided such demonstration project is not under construction, and thereby allow a State to make greater use of such funding for higher priority projects.

Indian reservation road exemption.—Section 346 of the bill exempts the Indian reservation roads program from reduction in authorizations otherwise required by section 1003(c) of Public Law 102–240.

INTERSTATE SUBSTITUTE HIGHWAYS

This program, part of the Federal-aid highways activity, provides funding of highways substituted for Interstate System segments withdrawn from the system under 23 U.S.C. 103(e)(4). After the joint request by a State Governor and the local governments concerned, the Secretary withdrew (from the Interstate System) interstate highway segments which would have passed through or connect urbanized areas within the State determined not to be essential to a unified Interstate System. The value of a withdrawn segment, adjusted for inflation, establishes an authorization against which Congress may provide funds.

Under existing law, all of the contract authority provided for highway projects substituted for withdrawn interstate highway segments has been distributed. As shown in the following table, there remains $33,300,000 needed to fully fund the substitute highway projects. However, no additional contract authority has been provided under existing law to distribute to these withdrawal areas.

ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE SUBSTITUTE HIGHWAY PROJECTS AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1995

State	Withdrawal area	Estimated additional funds required to complete substitute highway projects [1]
Arizona	Tucson	$11,889
California	San Francisco	1,204,533
Connecticut	Bolton to Killingly	10,042,918
	Hartford-New Britain	321,448
Washington, DC	Washington	78,607
Georgia	Atlanta	638,986
Maryland	Baltimore	1,562,592

ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE SUBSTITUTE HIGHWAY PROJECTS AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1995—Continued

State	Withdrawal area	Estimated additional funds required to complete substitute highway projects [1]
	Bowie-Millersville	415,757
	Washington	47,050
Massachusetts	Boston	1,779
	Fall River to Providence	77,459
New Jersey	New York City	234,755
	New York City-Trenton	1,388,601
New York	New York City	11,875,419
Rhode Island	Rhode Island	4,003,336
Tennessee	Memphis	1,409,446
Totals		33,314,577

[1] Amounts are in Federal funds and assume full obligation of the fiscal year 1995 apportionments and prior-year discretionary allocations and formula apportionments.

BRIDGE DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

In the past, the Committee has directed the Secretary of Transportation to give priority designation, consistent with existing criteria, to several bridges that have extremely low rating factors and which serve as major links for both intrastate and interstate commerce and which directly impact the economic development of an area. The ISTEA legislation distributes all but $60,500,000 of the total $2,763,000,000 available by statutory formula.

The Committee directs funding for the following bridge projects consistent with existing criteria:

State Routes 1 and 9 (2AG), New Jersey
Sidney Lanier Bridge, Brunswick, GA

DISCRETIONARY INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, Public Law 102–240, authorized the interstate resurfacing, restoring, or rehabilitation of routes at a total program level of $2,914,000,000 for fiscal year 1996. The ISTEA legislation distributes mostly all of these funds by statutory formula. However, $64,000,000 of National Highway System funds are set aside for 4–R work.

The Committee directs funding for the following discretionary interstate maintenance consistent with existing criteria: I–15 Spring Mountain Interchange in Clark County, NV and I–79, between Clendenin and Amma, in Kanawha and Roane Counties, WV.

FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAMS

Consistent with section 1032 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 that provides funds for projects for tourism and recreational travel, the Committee directs that priority

consideration be given the following projects: Olympic National Park, WA, and SR 160, Pahrump Road, Pahrump, NV.

The Committee directs that before distribution of funds, $6,000,000 be made available for interstate access, known as the Chenoweth Interchange, to facilities identified in section 16(b)(1) of Public Law 99–663.

INTERSTATE DISCRETIONARY

Under the ISTEA highway authorization, the final set-aside of funds for the Interstate Discretionary Program occurred in fiscal year 1995. As of March 1995, $58,000,000 of these funds were available for distribution which is expected to occur in fiscal year 1995.

FERRY BOAT AND FACILITIES

Under Public Law 102–240, $17,000,000 is available in fiscal year 1996 for ferry boat and facilities construction. The Committee directs that out of the available funds, priority consideration be given to the following projects: passenger ferry deck rehabilitation on the MV *Chelan* in Washington State; docking slip refurbishment in Port Vashon, WA, and prince of Wales Island, AK, marine ferry.

TIMBER BRIDGE

Section 1039(e) of Public Law 102–240 provides discretionary highway timber research and demonstration program funding. Consistent with the criteria established in section 1039, $1,000,000 is available for research grants and information transfer and $7,500,000 is available for construction grants.

HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS

Section 1105(h) of Public Law 102–240 provides discretionary funds to study high priority corridors for possible inclusion in the National Highway System. Consistent with the criteria established in section 1105, the Committee directs that such projects be given priority consideration to receive these study and planning funds.

SCENIC BYWAYS

Consistent with the criteria established in section 1047 of Public Law 102–240 for the Scenic Byways Program, the FHWA may use previously provided contract authority.

EMERGENCY RELIEF

The Federal Highway Administration's emergency relief program allows the Secretary of Transportation to provide assistance to States when highways and bridges are damaged during natural disasters or other emergencies. The Federal Highway Administration has found the Hannibal Bridge eligible for emergency relief funding as a result of the damage sustained during the Midwest floods of 1993. The Committee finds that the narrow two-lane bridge, built in 1934, fails to ensure motorist safety or serve modern transportation needs with ratings of the bridge indicating both safety and structural deficiencies. With these conditions, the Com-

mittee believes it would be a more prudent use of emergency relief funds to apply $28,000,000 to the construction of a replacement bridge.

INTELLIGENT VEHICLE/HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

[In thousands of dollars]

	House allowance	Committee recommendation [1]
Paralympiad	.....	1,000
Northeast corridor (I–95)	7,000	([2])
Houston corridor, TX	2,400	2,000
I–10 Mobile, AL	4,000	
VA/MD capitol beltway	6,000	4,000
Santa Teresa border crossing, NM	.....	900
University of North Dakota	.....	1,000
University of Texas, El Paso	1,000	.....
Texas Transportation Institute	600	.....
Western Transportation Institute, Montana	.....	1,000
Johnson City, TN	3,000	.....
TRANSCOM, New York/New Jersey	.....	1,500
Syracuse, NY, congestion management	3,000	.....
New York State Thruway	.....	3,000
National Transportation Center, Oakdale, NY	.....	1,000
Advanced railroad/highway crossings	.....	2,500
Hazardous materials safety	5,000	.....
Oregon green light CVO project	6,000	8,000

[1] The Committee is recommending funding up to the levels listed and not absolute amounts. It believes FHWA should have maximum ability to maximize State, local, and private funding for these projects.
[2] Funding for this project is included in the congested corridor program.

The Committee maintains that FHWA should enter into additional operational tests that advance technology and simultaneously demonstrate new institutional arrangements. The Committee expects that FHWA will vigorously seek out such qualified projects as part of future solicitations for proposals regarding IVHS operational tests.

In the report accompanying the 1992 act, the Committee stated that it was going to base funding decisions on the guidance and direction provided by the IVHS strategic plan. By following this strategy, the Committee sought to ensure the most cost-effective use of public dollars, allow for a systematic analysis of proposed operational tests and ensure rational and orderly advancement of IVHS. Consistent with this approach and the provisions of the IVHS Act of 1991, the Committee's allowance seeks to maximize the flexibility provided to FHWA in awarding contracts and in entering into cooperative agreements for corridor and IVHS operational tests. This strategy will allow FHWA to seek the maximum non-Federal contributions for joint Federal/State government/industry projects and to fund innovative projects that will advance the state of IVHS technology. The Committee strongly believes that FHWA needs this flexibility in order to continue its effective management of the National IVHS Program in concert with the IVHS strategic plan.

The Committee notes recent advancements in information technology and its applicability to complex transportation systems,

such as the system which will run in Atlanta next summer during the conduct of the Paralympic Games. The Committee has included $1,000,000 for development and demonstration of an individualized routing system to maximize the ability of people with disabilities to move about independently during the Paralympiad.

The Committee notes the safety and efficiency results that are being achieved by the Oakland County, MI, FAST–TRAC operational test. The Committee recommends that the joint program office continue funding this test subject to the availability of funds. Funding of $1,000,000 has been provided to both the Western Transportation Institute, Montana, and the National Transportation Center, New York. The Committee understands that with this funding the Federal commitment to each is completed.

In order to maximize the Federal investment the Committee intends that any funding provided be used only in support of or research on intelligent transportation systems and not for construction of buildings.

RIGHT-OF-WAY REVOLVING FUND

(LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	($42,500,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 authorized $300,000,000 for the establishment of the Right-of-Way Revolving Fund. This fund is utilized to make cash advances to the States for the purpose of purchasing right-of-way parcels in advance of highway construction and thereby preventing the inflation of land prices from causing a significant increase in construction costs. When right-of-way acquisition has been made and highway construction is initiated, the State becomes eligible for Federal grants under the various Federal-aid highway authorizations. At the point when progress payments are made to the State for construction, the State in turn reimburses the revolving fund for advances made to that State for right-of-way acquisition. Utilizing this method of funding, all reimbursements made to the revolving fund may be reallocated to other States requiring advances.

In the administrations budget request, this program was proposed for termination in 1996. It will continue to be shown for reporting purposes as loan balances remain outstanding. A prohibition on further obligations was requested for 1996.

The continued obligation for returned amounts to this fund will occur. The Carson City bypass project in Carson City, NV, will be given priority for any funds made available under this program.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	($73,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(68,000,000)
House allowance	(68,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(68,000,000)

This program was first authorized by the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982. It provides grants to States for improved enforcement of Federal and State motor carrier safety rules. It has been shown that added enforcement of truck safety rules reduces truck-related accidents and fatalities. The major objective of this program is to reduce the number and severity of accidents involving commercial motor vehicles.

The Committee recommends a liquidating cash appropriation of $68,000,000 level which is the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The administration proposes to fund the program at the ISTEA-authorized level of $85,000,000. The Committee is recommending an obligation ceiling of $75,000,000 for motor carrier safety grants. This is $10,000,000 below the level requested by the administration and $4,150,000 below the House allowance and expects the funds to be distributed as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1995 appropriation	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Basic grants to States	55,550	62,812	60,000	55,550
Administrative expenses	825	1,063	875	825
Traffic enforcement	6,375	7,000	6,875	6,925
CDL enforcement	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Hazardous materials training	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Truck and bus accidents	1,500	2,000	1,750	1,750
Uniformity grants	3,450	5,000	3,800	3,450
Uniformity working groups	450	1,000	450	450
Commercial vehicle information system	1,500	2,000	1,500	1,700
Drug interdiction assistance	500	.....	.....	500
Research and development	500	775	500	500
Public education	850	850	850	850
Total	74,000	85,000	79,150	75,000

The Committee recognizes the many positive accomplishments of the 5,140 State officers and 120 FHWA personnel who contribute at least part time to the MCSAP. The Committee applauds the actions taken by FHWA and the States, with support from MCSAP, to improve compatibility of the safety regulations throughout the Nation.

The additional funds provided will be used to increase traffic enforcement which has been shown to be effective in dealing with

major causal factors in crashes involving commercial vehicles. Before October 1, 1996, FHWA is directed to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report on the effectiveness, benefits, and costs of traffic enforcement as a means of reducing the frequency and severity of crashes involving commercial motor vehicles and as a means of improving regulatory compliance, including compliance with State and local traffic codes. The report should analyze the impact of traffic enforcement on crash reduction, assess the acceptance of this enforcement strategy as part of the MCSAP in the law enforcement community, and evaluate whether traffic enforcement targeted at high-risk locations is a useful strategy in improving highway safety. Furthermore, the report should evaluate the impact that dedicating funds for traffic enforcement activities have on the number of law enforcement officers concerned with and trained to deal with commercial motor vehicle carrier safety. To obtain quantitative as well as qualitative data, OMC will use a variety of research strategies, including a review and compilation of data contained in State enforcement plans, the conduct of a diversity of special enforcement projects in different geographic locations, and statistical analyses of past inspection data on the number of out-of-service violations issued as a result of traffic enforcement operations as compared to other enforcement strategies.

The Committee supports FHWA encouraging those States without pen-based systems to use a small portion of their basic grants to purchase pen-based information systems for use at the roadside. These systems have been accepted by the MCSAP community, are relatively inexpensive, and save data entry expenses. More importantly, these systems will ensure that SAFETYNET data is current and timely. The Committee also supports FHWA's efforts to work with the States to incorporate modern brake testing technology into their inspection protocols.

The Committee denies the full amount of funding requested for MCSAP for several reasons: (1) rapid expansion of the program—in fiscal year 1995 MCSAP received an increase in funding of $9,000,000 over fiscal year 1994, thus continuing the substantial growth enjoyed by this program during the last 5 years; (2) concern that some States have not conducted adequate verification programs, including a sufficient number of covert operations; and (3) budgetary limitations.

Within the funds provided for Truck and Bus Accident Data Grant Program, $200,000 shall be used to conduct a model accident investigation and reconstruction program, including the training of MCSAP officers on investigation techniques.

The Committee's allowance includes $500,000 for the Drug Interdiction Assistance Program. As a result of this program over 350 drug seizures from commercial motor vehicles have been documented, totaling over 259,000 pounds of marijuana, over 78,000 pounds of cocaine, and $9,300,000 in currency seizures. DIAP has facilitated training over 17,000 law enforcement officers.

The Committee's allowance includes $850,000 for activities to educate the public on sharing the road with commercial motor vehicles. These funds will allow the development of new national

campaign materials, but will primarily be used to provide grants for State activities.

Out-of-service orders.—Since 1988 the Committee has sought to ensure that the MCSAP community pays more attention to the problem of drivers failing to comply with out-of-service orders. The Committee applauds the actions of many MCSAP States, the FHWA, and the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance [CVSA] to begin to deal more systematically with this challenge. FHWA reports that the State enforcement plans show that more States are realizing that they have a verification problem. Through a variety of mechanisms, FHWA has been encouraging the States to pay more attention to this issue. For example, FHWA has completed a best practices manual that was developed primarily by a peer review group of MCSAP officers, working with CVSA and a university. FHWA also has sponsored two ITS projects to test technologies that may eventually help address this problem. As part of its fiscal year 1996 ITS/CVO request, FHWA has proposed and the Committee has recommended the funding of $400,000 to develop a model out-of-service prototype system.

Despite these positive accomplishments, recent data compiled by FHWA showed that more than 21 percent of the drivers/vehicles that were observed during covert enforcement projects and then rechecked for compliance violated an out-of-service order. State data submitted to FHWA also showed that some of the drivers that violated an out-of-service order were not even issued a citation. The Committee reminds FHWA that the Motor Carrier Safety Act of 1990 required FHWA to ensure that the States receiving MCSAP have in place ''a system for ensuring that appropriate State penalties are assessed for failure to correct any such safety violation.'' The Committee believes that both FHWA and the MCSAP community should be more concerned that too many drivers are not complying with orders to get imminently hazardous violations repaired and are deliberately trying to subterfuge the intent of MCSAP.

FHWA reports that some States are not collecting useful data on their covert operations even though FHWA requires this information as part of the MCSAP, some seven States are spending less than 20 hours a year conducting covert verification activities, and about one-half of the States are actually rechecking more than 20 vehicles a year using a covert strategy. FHWA is expected to work with the States to address these deficiencies.

Covert surveillance has a valuable role in the MCSAP, even if used sparingly, to periodically suppress the temptation to jump out-of-service orders and to quantify and monitor the extent of this problem. The Committee realizes that covert verification is expensive, but this essential enforcement strategy protects the integrity of the entire MCSAP. Consequently, the Committee directs that no less than $2,000,000 be allocated for the conduct of covert operations. FHWA must ensure that these funds are used to support covert operations in addition to those originally planned in each State's enforcement plan [SEP]. The Committee wants these additional funds to be used throughout the year. Because FHWA is using a substantial portion of the fiscal year 1995 funds allocated for covert operations to characterize the type of motor carrier operation that is associated with those drivers most likely to violate an

out-of-service order, the Committee directs that the funds provided in fiscal year 1996 be used only for covert enforcement activities, that is, to recheck drivers/vehicles that may be attempting to violate an out-of-service order. FHWA will continue to use a portion of reallocated funds to encourage covert verification activities.

The Committee objects to the House recommendation regarding covert verification for several reasons:

One: Funds for this essential activity should not depend upon the uncertain availability of reallocated moneys.

Two: There is no assurance that a sufficient number of covert operations will be conducted throughout the year and that baseline monitoring data on the extent of the verification problem will be available for review by the Committee. The House language allows funds for compliance reviews and other enforcement strategies which may be conducted many months after a driver has violated an out-of-service order. Not only could these strategies pose legal uncertainties making an enforcement action less certain, but they may allow a vehicle in an imminently hazardous condition to return to our Nation's highways.

Three: The amount recommended is insufficient, given the size of the verification challenge.

Before April 1, 1996, FHWA is directed to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report which presents: (1) data on the results of covert operations conducted during fiscal years 1995 and 1996 (as of December 31, 1995); (2) data showing that each State receiving MCSAP dollars is conducting an appropriate number of covert operations; (3) data showing that each State adjusts the extent and scope of its covert verification activities in relationship to the extent and nature of its verification challenge; (4) a description of changes that each of the States has made to their MCSAP in response to the best practices manual issued by FHWA; (5) evidence that the States are conducting covert verification activities throughout the year; and (6) a description of the penalties imposed by each of the States for violating an out-of-service order and the means used by each State or FHWA to publicize the actions taken against drivers that violate out-of-service orders. FHWA should collect similar data on fiscal year 1996 MCSAP activities in anticipation of a future reporting requirement.

The Committee appreciates the progress FHWA and various MCSAP officers are making to increase the number of States that place U.S. DOT numbers on traffic citations issued to commercial motor vehicle operators. The Committee believes that this information will provide additional input into the selective compliance and enforcement [SCE] system which is used to select which motor carriers should receive a compliance review.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Appropriations, 1995	$352,055,000
Rescission (prior-year balances)	(12,004,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	39,500,000

The administration's budget did not propose new funding in fiscal year 1996 to continue demonstration projects. Rather, the budg-

et proposed that appropriated demonstration projects that will be continued for fiscal year 1996 and thereafter with spending of prior-year balances controlled by obligation limitations of $25,000,000 from trust funds and $65,000,000 from general funds.

The House has not included any additional general funds for surface transportation projects which are authorized in existing law or had received prior appropriations.

The Committee has included funding for several highway projects that had received general funds in the past from the Committee and that could be completed with a final funding installment. All of the funding will be used for final construction only and meet prior commitments. None of the funds are for new projects or activities that are preliminary to construction. The Committee expects that this will be the last appropriation of general funds for each of the listed projects.

Lock & dam 4, Arkansas	$4,000,000
State Route 2 (Merritt's Creek Connector), West Virginia	9,050,000
Vermillion-Newcastle, SD	2,800,000
Springfield-Niobrara, NE	3,400,000
6th/7th St., Brownsville, TX	500,000
Brownsville rail relocation, Texas	3,000,000
34th Street, Moorhead, MN	5,300,000
Des Moines to Ottumwa, IA	6,450,000
I–10/610 Interchange, Louisiana	5,000,000

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1996 PROGRAM

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA] was established as a separate organizational entity in the Department of Transportation in March 1970, to reduce the mounting number of deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from traffic crashes on the Nation's highways. New responsibilities were enacted later for improving automotive fuel economy and instituting other consumer programs. The National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act provides for the establishment and enforcement of Federal safety standards for motor vehicles and associated equipment and research, including the operation of required testing facilities. The Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act initially provided for the establishment of low-speed collision bumper standards, consumer information activities, diagnostic inspection, and odometer regulations and was later amended to incorporate responsibility for the administration of Federal automotive fuel economy standards. Under section 403 of title 23, United States Code, technical assistance is provided to the States in the conduct of their highway safety programs, and research and demonstration projects are conducted to develop and show the effectiveness of new techniques and countermeasures to address highway safety problems.

Grants are provided to the States under title 23, United States Code, section 402 to assist in the establishment and improvement of highway safety programs designed to reduce traffic crashes, deaths, and injuries. Grants are funded as contract authority and apportioned by formula to the States. Incentive grants are also allocated to the States for driver impairment safety programs under title 23, United States Code, section 410. In addition, some Fed-

eral-aid highway apportionments may be transferred, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 153, to States that have not put motorcycle helmet and safety belt use laws into effect.

The Committee recommends a total program level of $276,950,000 for the activities and programs of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration for fiscal year 1996. This is $63,392,000 less than the budget request and $1,778,000 less than the House allowance.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1995 program level	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendations
Operations and research	126,553	144,342	125,329	121,605
(Trust fund)	(46,997)	(59,744)	(52,012)	(50,344)
Highway traffic safety grants:				
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(151,000)	(180,000)	(153,400)	(155,100)
Safety formula grants [1]	123,000	168,600	126,000	128,000
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures [1]	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
National Driver Register [1]	3,400	2,400	2,400	2,100
Total	277,953	340,342	278,729	276,705

[1] Obligation ceiling on contract authority.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(INCLUDING TRUST FUNDS)

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 1995	$79,556,000	$46,997,000	$126,553,000
Budget estimate, 1996	84,598,000	59,744,000	144,342,000
House allowance	[1] 73,316,570	52,011,930	[1] 125,328,500
Committee recommendation	71,261,000	50,344,000	121,605,000

[1] Does not include $4,547,185 rescission.

The bill includes an appropriation of $121,605,000 for operations and research, which is $22,737,000 less than the budget request and $3,723,500 less than the House allowance.

This level of funding provides for 644 full-time permanent positions, as requested in the budget. The position and FTE levels by program are listed in the table. The amount appropriated is to be distributed as follows:

[Dollars amounts in thousands]

Program	Fiscal year 1995 appropriation level	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Rulemaking	$11,136	$14,787	$12,420	$12,422
(Positions)	(95)	(95)	(95)	(95)
Enforcement	$18,028	$19,737	$19,211	$17,670
(Positions)	(103)	(103)	(103)	(103)
Highway safety	$39,039	$50,681	$44,455	$42,169

[Dollars amounts in thousands]

Program	Fiscal year 1995 appropriation level	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
(Positions)	(203)	(203)	(203)	(203)
Research and analysis	$50,885	$52,437	$42,737	$44,657
(Positions)	(132)	(132)	(132)	(132)
Office of Administrator	$3,683	$3,820	$3,820	$3,820
(Positions)	(41)	(41)	(41)	(41)
General administration	$8,952	$9,038	$8,938	$8,658
(Positions)	(90)	(90)	(90)	(90)
Grant administration reimbursement	−$6,043	−$6,158	−$6,043	−$6,158
Accountwide adjustments			$209	−$1,633
Total	$125,680	$144,342	$125,329	$122,605
(Positions)	(664)	(644)	(644)	(644)

Adjustments have been made to the administration's requested level in the following accounts:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1996 budget request	Committee recommendations
Rulemaking:		
Vehicle safety standards	850	−200
Fuel economy program	2,285	−2,165
Enforcement:		
Auto safety hotline	1,667	−1,567
Vehicle safety compliance	5,353	−500
Highway safety programs:		
Safe communities injury control	5,600	−5,225
Alcohol, drug and State programs	10,815	−2,453
National occupant protection	6,400	−534
Driver fatigue and inattention		+1,000
Child safety seat program	1,600	−1,200
Enforcement and emergency service	2,728	−300
Highway safety research (older driver)	390	+200
Research and analysis:		
Biomechanics safety and research systems	7,450	−1,290
Partnership for a new generation of vehicles [PNGV]	5,000	−5,000
National Center for Statistics and Analysis	18,815	−1,490
Fatal accident reporting system	(5,000)	(−300)
National accident sampling system	(9,500)	(−300)
Data analysis program	(2,000)	(−500)
State data systems	(2,000)	(−390)
General administration:		
Program evaluation (Anti-Car Theft Act)	489	−180
Strategic planning	200	−200
Accountwide adjustments		−1,633
Administrative services		(−623)
Computer support		(−579)
Travel		(−50)
Bonuses		(−200)
Overtime		(−60)
Training		(−93)
Field office expenses/regional offices		(−28)
Net change to budget request		−22,737

RULEMAKING

Anticipated rulemakings.—NHTSA testified that during fiscal year 1995 final regulations requiring head injury protection, dynamic side impact protection for light trucks and vans, upgraded child safety seats, truck underride devices, and rear door latch strength are expected. In fiscal year 1996 NHTSA anticipates regulatory action on rollover stability and labeling.

The Committee notes the delay in issuance of the head impact final rule which ISTEA required the Secretary to issue by February 1995. NHTSA estimates that head impacts with vehicle pillars, roof side rails, windshield headers, and rear headers result in nearly 3,000 passenger car occupant fatalities and more than 400 occupant fatalities in light trucks and vans each year. NHTSA estimates that the proposed final rule should decrease the number of these fatalities by about one-third.

Vehicle safety standards.—The Committee recommends $650,000 for the vehicle safety standards program, the same as the House and an increase of $150,000 over the fiscal year 1995 enacted level. The budget request was $850,000 for this account. The Office of Safety Performance Standards requested $300,000 for consumer information. The Committee's allowance includes $150,000 to complete this work. A major portion of the survey design, collection, and evaluation activity needed to obtain this information should be conducted using existing headquarters and regional staff. With the increased flexibility provided to the States under the section 402 program, NHTSA regional personnel will have sufficient time to help collect survey data. This will enable regional staff to contribute to an agency function which traditionally has not received their direct assistance.

The Committee maintains that NHTSA could develop the consumer brochure on alternative-fueled vehicles using its own personnel and, therefore, the $50,000 requested for this activity is denied. Any funds needed to publish and distribute this document should be obtained from NHTSA's printing funds.

New car assessment program [NCAP].—The Committee recommends $2,792,000 for the NCAP Program, the same amount requested in the budget but $1,057,000 more than the amount provided by the House. The Committee disagrees with the House recommendation to reduce funding for promotional activities related to NCAP. The NCAP promotional program is designed to improve NHTSA's responsiveness to consumer and media requests for NCAP vehicle safety test results, and as such, is a vital and visible liaison with the driving public.

The Committee has provided $857,000 for NCAP side impact testing. The amount could provide for the testing of up to 27 vehicles in fiscal year 1996.

NHTSA has informed the Committee that for model year 1996, 40 percent of the passenger car fleet must meet the upgraded side impact standard. More than 60 different makes and models will be certified by the manufacturers as meeting the new requirements in model year 1996. The Committee understands that manufacturers are scheduling new model introductions that incorporate the

changes to meet the new standard. Many of these models will remain unchanged for several years.

There may be ways to improve the dissemination of test results. Several experts have expressed their concern regarding the need to improve the display of NCAP information or to better explain its current star rating system. The Committee directs NHTSA to revisit the issue of how this information can best be presented to consumers.

Fuel economy program.—The Committee recommends $120,000 for the fuel economy program, which is $2,165,000 below the amount requested. The House provided $285,000 for this account. This recommendation will allow continuation of NHTSA's ongoing activities at the same amount provided for during fiscal year 1995. This amount does not allow continuation of one-time expenses incurred in fiscal year 1995 for the mandated study on the uses of light trucks and vans.

The Committee also has not provided the funds requested for the environmental assessment on CAFE. The agency has the flexibility to use its own staff to prepare environmental assessments when a rulemaking action would not have a significant effect on the environment, for example, when fairly minor increases in CAFE such as 0.1 miles to 0.2 miles per year are proposed. In addition, the Committee has not been convinced of the need for an expansion of studies on new fuel economy technologies. The Department of Energy [DOE] conducts similar research and budget limitations should encourage NHTSA to work more closely with DOE.

Theft protection program.—The Committee provides $110,000, the administration's requested level, and disagrees with the House's increase of $890,000 to pilot test an information system. The Committee believes funding such a pilot initiative would be premature. Investing in a multistate titling system first requires establishing titling uniformity among States; without uniform definitions of terms such as ''salvage vehicle,'' sharing such inconsistent information among States would be almost useless. The establishment of titling uniformity was a key recommendation of the Motor Vehicle Titling, Registration and Salvage Advisory Committee, established by the Anti-Car Theft Act of 1992. The Department has indicated it is drafting Federal legislation to establish State uniformity. Until such consistency is in place, the Committee believes that implementing a titling system is unjustified. In addition, current fiscal constraints demand that new initiatives are most appropriate for activities supporting NHTSA's primary mission of improving highway safety.

Uniform tire quality grading standards.—The House bill includes a prohibition on any rulemaking which would require that passenger car tires be labeled to indicate their low rolling resistance, or fuel economy characteristics. The Committee has struck the House provision, and does not include any such limitation or prohibition on rulemakings in respect to grading standards for tires.

ENFORCEMENT

Odometer fraud program.—The Committee has provided a total of $100,000 for the Odometer fraud program. Odometer fraud is a crime that costs consumers over $3,000,000,000 each year by false-

ly inflating the cost of used cars and causing unplanned maintenance and repair costs. These funds will help NHTSA's efforts to investigate such illegal activities.

Defect investigations.—The Committee has provided $2,460,000 for defects investigation activities. The defects investigation program seeks data from consumers on potential defects, performs tests and surveys on vehicle equipment, and conducts detailed investigations to identify vehicle safety risks. When unreasonable safety risks are identified, efforts are initiated to obtain a safety recall from the manufacturer. The program's auto safety hotline provides requested highway safety information to consumers and obtains motor vehicle safety defect reports from consumers to assist NHTSA in initiating investigations.

Auto safety hotline.—The Committee recommends $657,000 for the auto safety hotline and stipulates that the additional $100,000 provided above the fiscal year 1995 appropriations will be used to hire additional contractors to improve responses leading to possible defect investigations. The Committee has reduced the request by $1,567,000 because of budget constraints and the need to fund higher priority requests.

One of the stated justifications for the substantial increase for the hotline was to establish a single point of contact for consumer inquiries to NHTSA. Although customer service is important, it does not need to be as expensive as proposed. The Committee believes that the agency should train its staff to refer calls expeditiously to appropriate offices. This would obviate the need for costly improvements in communications infrastructure. NHTSA should revisit its expensive proposal and find a more cost-effective means of improving customer service.

Vehicle safety compliance.—The Committee has provided $4,853,000, which is $500,000 less than the amount requested, for vehicle safety compliance activities. The Vehicle Safety Compliance Program ensures that all motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment sold in the United States will provide the safety benefits associated with all Federal safety standards. Given the level of defect investigations and recalls each year, as well as the importance of complex safety standards, the Committee believes that it is essential to provide adequate funding for the Vehicle Safety Compliance Program in fiscal year 1996.

HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

Safe communities injury control.—The Committee provides $375,000 for three demonstrations of the community injury control partnerships, which is $5,225,000 less than the budget request. The ability to cost share will be one of the criteria on which potential grantees will be evaluated. NHTSA will ensure that these demonstrations compliment and do not duplicate injury control projects sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. These funds will allow NHTSA to work with three communities in different States to obtain quantitative data on benefits and costs and a compilation of best practices that will be useful in improving the safe communities initiative. These demonstrations are scheduled to run for at least 3 years. In view of the time required to conduct such evaluations and to publish results, the full benefits of

these demonstrations are not anticipated until 1999 at the earliest. The Committee believes that injury control is such an important objective that waiting for these results before initiating the safe communities program would not be in the public interest. Consequently, funds to implement this initiative are not recommended under the section 402 program.

Alcohol, drug, and State programs.—The Committee commends NHTSA for implementing the safe and sober campaign, a program which primarily addresses alcohol impairment and seat belt use. As structured by NHTSA, this well planned initiative provides considerable flexibility to the States, and offers innovative quarterly campaign documents that have been well received by the safety community. Because of budget limitations, the Committee is providing $8,362,000, and is unable to provide the additional $2,453,000 requested to expand this program and the safe and sober campaign. The funds recommended, however, will allow for adequate dissemination of the necessary public information campaign materials, and will sponsor statewide demonstration projects to illustrate how periodic, highly publicized law enforcement can achieve significant progress toward a reduction in the number of deaths and injuries from alcohol impairment and failure to use occupant protection.

Local technical assistance centers.—The Committee maintains that the Local Technical Assistance Program centers [LTAP] should play an increased role in highway safety by serving as depositories of NHTSA documents and training materials. This function is consistent with the legislative mandate regarding LTAP centers to enhance programs for the movement of passenger and freight. To this end, the Committee expects the NHTSA Administrator to work closely with the FHWA Administrator to improve NHTSA's use of and assistance to the LTAP centers. NHTSA shall provide to each of the LTAP centers training materials and various publications designed to benefit State and local officials dealing with highway safety, including driver behavior challenges and their countermeasures. NHTSA shall widely publicize the availability of this technical assistance to local governmental entities. This additional assistance will be especially timely in assisting local governmental entities and States in implementing the Safe Communities Program, a new initiative funded under the section 402 program. Because of additional publication costs, the Committee disagrees with the House proposal to reduce funds for printing by $72,000. Increased coordination and cooperation among the LTAP centers, the Governors' highway safety representatives, and the NHTSA regional offices should be encouraged.

Child Safety Seat Program (Patterns for Life).—The Committee recommends $400,000, a reduction of $1,200,000 below the budget request, for the Patterns for Life Program which is designed to increase the safety of children riding in motor vehicles, crossing the street as pedestrians, or riding on bicycles. The program will focus on the proper use of child safety devices such as child safety seats, bicycle helmets, and clothing markers. The Committee expects NHTSA to combine private sector efforts to distribute safety devices with public sector efforts and to teach parents and other caregivers about the proper use and effectiveness of these devices.

NHTSA's activities will focus on development, marketing, and distribution of training and educational materials in formats which widely diverse population groups may use. NHTSA also will work with the enforcement community to promote the use of these devices. The availability of a substantially increased amount of private sector moneys only underscores the importance of establishing a dedicated infrastructure to provide adequate training and technical assistance to promote the highway safety of America's youngest population group. NHTSA shall design the overall program in such a manner that it will be self-sufficient at the earliest possible date.

As originally proposed by NHTSA, the Patterns for Life Program was intended to focus only on child safety seats. NHTSA now supports an expansion of the program to the other areas of child traffic safety identified above. This expansion is more than justified, especially when one considers that there are about 300 traffic-related deaths annually of children less than 15 years old riding on bicycles.

Emergency medical services [EMS].—The Committee fully supports the amount proposed in the budget of $1,122,000 for the EMS program. The House recommended only $870,000 for EMS curricula revisions and other technical assistance activities, but disapproved funding requested for public information and education, communications, and research and evaluation initiatives. The results of the 40 EMS statewide technical assessments, performed recently by the States with NHTSA's technical assistance, show that States need the most assistance in these same three areas. Because the need for this assistance is extensive.

The Committee wants to ensure that continued improvements are made to the public education campaign entitled "Make the Right Call [MTRC]." This program is already recognized as a cost-effective activity to assist local governments and victims of traffic crashes. By educating the public on how to access EMS services, this campaign helps get emergency care quickly to those who need it and also reduces costs by avoiding unnecessary EMS calls. This campaign has been used by other Government agencies such as the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, DHHS, the U.S. Fire Administration, FEMA, and by health care provider organizations such as the American College of Emergency Physicians. The Committee agrees with NHTSA that the results from the fiscal year 1995 five site evaluation should be used to improve the campaign and aid in the development of new materials for high-risk populations and cellular phone users. In fiscal year 1996 new MTRC materials would be developed to educate the public on when and when not to call EMS, and what to do before the ambulance arrives. Limiting the MTRC campaign, as proposed by the House, would result in wasted public resources as evidenced by the high volume of calls that divert EMS from real emergencies and increase health care costs.

The Committee also supports NHTSA's work on building statewide communications systems for EMS. Rapidly moving cellular communication technology has created serious problems for EMS providers and users. In particular, 911 EMS calls on cellular telephones frequently are routed to answering points well outside the local EMS response area. There is no universal number to call for

an emergency from a cellular phone. Together with the cellular industry, NHTSA will develop technology to address such challenges and improve the efficient use of EMS resources throughout the country.

With the research and evaluation funds recommended, NHTSA will be able to help States determine where resources can most effectively be spent in EMS. These results will help build partnerships with managed care and other health care organizations to improve the Nation's health care system and, at the same time, cut costs.

Police traffic services.—The Committee has provided $1,306,000 for this account and has deleted the $300,000 requested for the large city injury control demonstration project. This activity was not specifically recommended in a recent TRB report on new directions in research to advance police traffic services. NHTSA has been unable to obtain cost sharing with other Federal agencies for this cooperative project. The feasibility of using traffic enforcement as a means of identifying criminal activities has been previously demonstrated elsewhere.

Older driver.—The Committee recommends $590,000 for older driver research, which is $200,000 above the request. This important safety program, which has begun to yield new knowledge to effectively address the older driver challenge, was funded at $500,000 in both fiscal years 1994–95. The additional funds recommended under the older driver program shall be used to improve and initally test referral systems and develop performance assessment techniques. This fundamental research will lead to a full-scale demonstration during fiscal year 1997 of technologies and practices that improve the driving performance and licensing of older drivers at risk of losing their licenses.

Younger driver.—The Committee requests the Administrator to work with the Office of the Surgeon General to update previous research on loopholes in State laws that adversely affect enforcement of the minimum drinking age requirement. This information is extremely important in helping to deal with the younger driver challenge. Updated information should be available before May 1, 1996.

Driver fatigue and inattention.—NHTSA data indicate that in recent years there have been about 56,000 crashes annually in which driver drowsiness/fatigue was cited by police. An annual average of roughly 40,000 nonfatal injuries and 1,550 fatalities result from these crashes. It is widely recognized that these statistics underreport the extent of these types of crashes. These statistics also do not deal with crashes caused by driver inattention, which is believed to be a larger problem. The Committee maintains that NHTSA has not devoted sufficient resources to understanding and dealing with the role of driver fatigue, sleep disorders, and inattention in highway safety. Consequently, the Committee's allowance includes $1,000,000 to analyze the role of these problem areas in highway crashes; to develop and test appropriate educational countermeasures; and to develop a strategy and lay the foundation for a public information campaign using a variety of media and approaches. These activities will be conducted in close cooperation with the National Center for Sleep Disorders Research. In planning this initiative, NHTSA should include an assessment of public

knowledge and behavior before and after the implementation of the public information campaign. The Committee intends to recommend additional funds for completion of the campaign and its evaluation in the future. The funds recommended above are in addition to any support for studies conducted under the ITS program.

Share the road campaign.—The Committee has invested substantial sums under the MCSAP for the share the road campaign and for traffic enforcement. Although no specific funds are recommended herein for an increased role of NHTSA in promoting commercial motor vehicle safety, the Committee requests the agency to work more closely with the Office of Motor Carriers, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, other law enforcement organizations, and the National Association of Governors's Highway Safety Representatives in this area. The Committee encourages NHTSA to assist in the dissemination of campaign materials and to encourage more police officers to enforce regulations dealing with hours of service competently.

Timely termination of ongoing activities.—The Committee has supported NHTSA's investment in the DEC, NETS, TEAM, and National Traffic Law Center. In response to the guidance provided by this Committee, NHTSA has been steadily decreasing its financial support of DEC and turning this responsibility over to the States. NHTSA had intended to phase out its financial support to other traffic safety promoting organizations in a timely manner, but recent changes in priorities have prolonged NHTSA's involvement. NHTSA needs to use its section 403 seed moneys to assist other innovative strategies and organizations. Consequently, the Committee directs NHTSA to prepare a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by May 1, 1996, specifying its exact plans for future financial support of each of these activities, as well as any other traffic safety organizations which have received support for more than 3 years. This report shall specify the fiscal year when financial support will end. For any activity requiring support after fiscal year 1997, NHTSA shall specify the reasons for continued expenditures and present a plan for eliminating its financial assistance to these continuing activities at the earliest possible time. This will force a rethinking of agency priorities and ensure that funds are reserved for new and innovative approaches to traffic safety.

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Biomechanics.—In recent years, the Committee has supported the biomechanics research program. However, budget constraints do not allow funding at the requested amount of $7,450,000. Instead, the Committee recommends $6,160,000, an increase of 10 percent above current levels. The Committee supports NHTSA's effort to improve the head injury component of its biomechanics program. Spending additional funds on countermeasures with respect to traumatic brain injury addresses an important societal need. Each year 75,000 to 100,000 Americans die as a result of a traumatic brain injury, with motor vehicle crashes causing one-half of all such injuries. Furthermore, a survivor of a severe brain injury typically faces 5 to 10 years of intensive rehabilitative services, with an estimated lifetime cost of $4,000,000.

The Committee supports a demonstration of the feasibility of the National Transportation Biomechanics Center, and urges NHTSA to seek cost-shared funds or demonstrate use of the center with other Federal entities as well as non-Federal partners. The Committee directs that not less than $1,600,000 will be used to conduct research on head injury and to build the technical expertise and management capabilities of the new center. The center will serve the following purposes: expanding DOT's expertise and capabilities to provide world leadership in the advancement of biomechanics of impact injuries and transportation safety; ensuring that biomechanics research is complementary and not duplicative; providing biomechanics information in all aspects of injury control; promoting injury prevention, acute care, and rehabilitation; and improving, promoting, and using the science of biomechanics in all transportation modes, both within the civilian and military sectors. Furthermore, the center will allow NHTSA to achieve increased efficiency in the biomechanics program with respect to bringing new and improved biomechanical tools (for example, test dummies) into use by the Government and the industry, and result in more rapid dissemination of useful research findings.

Before June 1, 1996, NHTSA should submit to both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a detailed review of the progress made in demonstrating the feasibility of the national center, a summary of cost-shared funds received or interest expressed in the center, a detailed plan for establishing the center, an evaluation of the benefits and costs of consolidating the Department's biomechanics research programs into the center, and a discussion of new technologies that promise substantial breakthroughs in the science of biomechanics that would be advanced at the center.

National advanced driving simulator [NADS].—The Committee supports the NADS and recommends $2,000,000, the amount requested in the budget, to continue progress leading toward operation of a world-class research facility that will underpin many future advances in highway safety.

The Committee opposes the House provision to rescind $4,547,185 of unobligated balances for the NADS project. The value and potential benefits of NADS needs to be emphasized. In-depth studies of accident causation have found that human factors, such as inadvertent errors of judgment, cognition, recognition, perception or motor function and aggressive or risk-taking driving behavior are contributing causes to more than 90 percent of all traffic crashes. Research into the fundamental nature of these causation factors is impeded because of the risk of exposing human subjects to severe physical injury. The national advanced driving simulator will allow such critical research to be conducted in the safe and repeatable confines of the laboratory. It will allow researchers to better understand the effects of prescription and nonprescription drugs on driving capabilities. In addition, the NADS will be of particular benefit in addressing younger and older driver issues and will contribute to the ITS program.

With respect to the younger driver, a major research requirement exists for the safe and systematic investigation of how various behavioral factors influence the crash frequency of young drivers. With this understanding, more effective mitigation programs in li-

censing, behavior modification, and warning systems could be devised. The NADS is essential to conducting this critical research.

With respect to the older driver, the NADS will allow researchers to determine correlations between specific defective driving practices or behaviors and specific accident types, so that effective driver aides and scientifically based, unbiased driver competency measures can be developed and implemented.

The NADS will allow modeling and testing of designs while new ITS technologies are still in the early conceptual stage, long before actual hardware prototypes are available. This will promote the low cost, low risk, development and fine tuning of ITS technologies and greatly shorten the time for their introduction into the marketplace. In addition, the NADS will allow engineers to ensure that the interface between these devices and the human driver is compatible, that is, the driver is presented with the type and amount of information that he or she can handle without causing distraction and information overload problems. This approach is now successfully being employed in the European Prometheus ITS Program using the Daimler-Benz and Swedish driving simulators.

The Committee believes it is in the national interest to build the NADS to ensure that NHTSA is not forced to continue to depend on foreign-based simulators, such as these in Sweden, Germany, and France, to conduct critical human factors research. The Daimler-Benz simulator in Germany is used to full capacity for vehicle product development, and no time is available to any researcher outside the parent company. According to NHTSA, the Swedish simulator is of limited usefulness because of its low fidelity motion and visual systems and its restriction to a fixed driving cab. The driving simulator being developed in France will have a much more limited motion-cuing system than NADS. Since this device is being funded by the French Government as well as the French auto industry, it is unlikely that testing time will be available to United States researchers.

The Committee would like to address some of the arguments made by the House to justify a denial of the funds needed to continue NADS. The House report incorrectly states that only two of the four conditions stipulated in the fiscal year 1995 conference report regarding future funding for the NADS have been met. In fact, three of the four conditions have now been met, and the fourth condition, having to do with a revised cost estimate for the NADS, will be met once negotiations have been completed with the phase II development contractor. In fact, as directed by the fiscal year 1995 conference report and as repeated here, no obligation of funds for the construction of the NADS will be made until updated cost information has been provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. Furthermore, the GAO reports that the total estimated project cost for the NADS is now $37,100,000. However, GAO breaks this figure down into the following components: (1) $32,000,000 for the NADS facility, (2) $4,500,000 for program management, (3) $200,000 for extension of the design contracts so that both contractors could further evaluate the software being contributed by the University of Iowa, (4) $175,000 to support the University's interaction with the contractors during the extended design contract, and (5) $255,000 for the TRB study on NADS utilization

mandated by the Congress. The Committee believes these cost estimates are reasonable and justified and recognizes that any further delays in the program would accelerate cost increases.

In addition to meeting the conditions of raising the required amount of non-DOT cost-sharing funds and securing the GAO's certification thereof, which the House agrees have been met, the third condition, pertaining to the TRB finding on utilization of NADS, has also been met. Specifically, the third condition as stated in the fiscal year 1995 conference report reads as follows: ''The Transportation Research Board [TRB] makes a determination that, if the driving simulator is built, it is highly likely that NADS will be used to at least 80 percent of full capacity, as defined by the TRB, after a startup period of 2 years; provided that for the purposes of the TRB determination, no more than 50 percent of the capacity usage is attributable to NHTSA.'' The finding of the TRB, as stated on page 1–1 of its report to the Congress is as follows: ''The Committee, with one exception, believes that after a startup period of at least 2 years, it is highly likely that the national advanced driving simulator [NADS] will be used to at least 80 percent of its design capacity, assuming that no more than one-half of this use is attributed to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration [NHTSA].'' Clearly this third condition has been met, since 12 of the 13 members of the TRB panel concur with this determination. The House did not acknowledge the TRB's conclusion, and instead focuses on the qualifications TRB placed on its conclusion.

The Committee strongly supports NHTSA's efforts to augment its in-house expertise with technical and managerial support from other Government agencies and outside experts that deal routinely with the development and acquisition of high fidelity simulators. To this end, NHTSA will put together a technical management and acquisition team that is comprised of highly experienced senior-level simulator experts both from outside of NHTSA and outside the DOT. The Committee directs that throughout the remaining construction and initial operation phases of the NADS that this technical input continue.

Partnership for a new generation of vehicles [PNGV].—The Committee has deleted funds for the PNGV program until vehicle design is further defined by the participants in this program.

ITS strategic plan.—Several years ago, the Committee directed NHTSA to prepare a 5-year strategic plan to guide the ITS research and development program. Both NHTSA and the Committee found this document extremely useful in understanding, evaluating, and planning the program. The Committee, therefore, directs the ITS Joint Program Office and NHTSA to update this plan to deal with the fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2002 period, and also to assess progress made regarding the objectives specified in the first plan. The revised plan shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before May 31, 1996.

National Center for Statistics and Analysis [NCSA].—The NCSA continues to provide the analytical foundation for much of NHTSA's activities. The Committee has carefully reviewed the request for the center and has reduced funding only because of budget constraints. The Committee is concerned that during the 1990–94 period, the NCSA experienced a 19-percent reduction in full-

time professional staff, while other NHTSA offices experienced about a 5-percent reduction in full-time (including professional) staff. This imbalance should be addressed as soon as possible. The Committee strongly supports NHTSA's efforts to use new technology to improve NASS data collection and expects NHTSA to allocate no less than $300,000, the amount requested by the agency, for this purpose.

NHTSA proposes to fund an expansion of activities similar to the CODES project as part of its State data program. Although the Committee supports the CODES activity, further expansion beyond the amount provided in the fiscal year 1996 base is not warranted. Therefore, the Committee recommends a decrease of $390,000 in the State data program, which is the amount requested for an expansion of the CODES component. Section 402 funds also may be used to improve traffic records and to conduct CODES activities.

Each year, NHTSA conducts a variety of surveys to accomplish various agency objectives. Often these surveys and their design are conducted with contract funds at considerable expense. The Committee believes that NHTSA's staff working at the NCSA and regional offices could reduce Federal expenditures by participating more actively in the design and conduct of these surveys. The Committee directs the Administrator to take the necessary steps to ensure that this occurs. Furthermore, when the next position in the NCSA is filled as part of planned personnel actions, the agency should give high priority to any individual that can contribute to the mission of the NCSA and is an expert in survey research methodology.

NHTSA and the highway safety community need updated and accurate information on the costs to society resulting from highway deaths and injuries and property damage. The Committee directs that NHTSA update its 1990 cost of injury study as soon as possible, but no later than May 1, 1996.

National Technical Information Service [NTIS].—NHTSA submitted information that some of its reports and publications were not entered into the National Technical Information Service [NTIS]. The Committee believes that, whenever practicable, reports and articles resulting from Government-sponsored research should be entered into NTIS in a timely manner and requests the Administrator to review agency policies pertaining to this matter.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Strategic planning.—Due to budget constraints, the Committee denies the request for $200,000 for strategic planning, which should be conducted using internal agency resources.

Anti-Car Theft Act evaluation.—The Committee believes that NHTSA should conduct the study on the antitheft act using its own staff resources and thus denies the request for $180,000 for contract support for this study. Within the Office of Strategic Planning and Evaluation, there are four professionals who conduct program evaluations.

ACCOUNTWIDE ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee is limiting the growth in computer support because this function has grown rapidly in recent years, going from

$1,610,000 in fiscal year 1992 to $2,552,000 in fiscal year 1995. Budget constraints necessitate the need to reduce moneys for electronic sharing of information, upgrade linkages to regional offices, and computer imaging upgrades.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

NHTSA rulemaking on CAFE standards.—The Committee has deleted bill language added by the House to withhold funds with respect to a NHTSA rulemaking regarding corporate average fuel economy [CAFE] standards (sec. 330). Funding issues regarding CAFE standards are also addressed in previous portions of this report.

National Highway Safety Advisory Committee.—The Committee has deleted the House general provision (sec. 313) prohibiting funding to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code, the National Highway Safety Advisory Committee.

Exemption to odometer disclosure requirement.—The Committee has included a general provision (sec. 356) enabling the Secretary of Transportation to administer and implement the exemption provisions of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act. These provisions have, for more than 20 years, exempted sellers of large trucks from the odometer disclosure regulation because these vehicles (weighing over 16,000 pounds) often travel more than 15,000 miles a month, and over the years their odometers may turn over several times. Most purchasing decisions with respect to these vehicles are based on service and maintenance records rather than odometer readings.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	($151,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(180,000,000)
House allowance	(153,400,000)
Committee recommendation	(155,100,000)

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (Public Law 102–240) provides for the continuation of the safety formula grant program. Grant allocations are determined on the basis of a statutory formula established under 23 U.S.C. 402. Individual States use this funding in areas which have the greatest potential for achieving safety improvements and reducing traffic crashes and fatalities. Activities are centered predominantly on efforts to control drivers impaired by alcohol and drugs; stimulate activities to improve occupant protection; improve traffic law enforcement and speed control; improve the quality of emergency medical services and trauma care systems; improve motorcycle, pedestrian, and bicycle safety; improve the collection and analysis of traffic accident data; and establish and maintain a computerized traffic record-keeping system.

The Committee recommends an appropriation for liquidation of contract authorization of $155,100,000 for the payment of obligations incurred in carrying out provisions of the State and Commu-

nity Highway Safety Program (sec. 402) and the Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grant Program (sec. 410).

The Committee has struck a new House provision prohibiting the use of section 402 funds for construction, rehabilitation or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local, or private buildings or structures.

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

FORMULA GRANTS (SEC. 402)

The Committee recommends an obligation limitation of $128,000,000 for the section 402 State and community highway safety grants program, which is $5,000,000 above the fiscal year 1995 appropriations for the section 402 program, and $40,600,000 less than requested. The Committee directs that the States pass through $5,000,000 to local communities to implement the safe communities initiative. NHTSA shall ensure that these moneys do not supplant assistance to local governmental entities previously provided under the base section 402 program.

The Committee maintains that the safe communities initiative is an excellent application of the seed money concept and thus is consistent with the purposes and intent of the section 402 program. The safe communities program would build upon the successes of over 400 community traffic safety programs [CTSP] by encouraging increased participation by businesses and public health organizations, among others, in local traffic safety efforts. Although some CTSP's already draw upon the business or medical community, there are numerous opportunities to maximize the contributions of these groups to highway safety.

These entities will bring new data, ideas, and resources to community-level safety programs. The safe communities concept also offers an opportunity to generate additional local traffic safety activity in the many locations where CTSP's are not located. The Committee encourages States, local communities, NHTSA, and other participants in the safe communities initiative to work toward the self-sufficiency of these projects to ensure their continuation after the Federal grants have ended.

The Committee objects to the language in the House bill which would disallow the purchase of automobiles and motorcycles with section 402 funds. The Committee contends that the use of such equipment is consistent with the seed money concept. Many States use such equipment to leverage additional staff positions from State and local law enforcement agencies. The equipment often is given to a law enforcement agency on the condition that the agency dedicates additional staff to highway safety-related education and enforcement programs. Once the Federal grant has ended, the State or local law enforcement agency must continue and assume full financial responsibility for the staff positions while taking ownership of the equipment. The equipment provides the incentive for a law enforcement agency to dedicate additional staff to highway safety. Furthermore, the Committee notes that the authorizing statute did not prohibit the use of section 402 funds for these purposes and that there is precedent for equipment purchases with Federal funds, namely section 402 funds and MCSAP funds are

used to purchase equipment which is essential for program implementation.

Section 403 and State and community highway safety program administrative set-aside.—As specified under the Section 403 Highway Safety Program, the Committee recommends funding for only 3 of 15 requested demonstration projects because it believes that those grants moneys under the section 402 program which are passed through to the local communities will be even more effective than the proposed grants to academic centers, trauma centers, hospitals, and other not-for-profit institutions. The Committee expects that many local communities will want to incorporate these institutions within their safe community programs to be funded under the section 402 program. The Committee, however, recognizes the value of additional evaluations of safe community projects under the direct control of local government. To this end, the Committee recommends that $300,000 of the section 402 administrative takedown funds be used to provide technical assistance to a wide range of local communities and State governments. These funds will be used either to develop the capability to evaluate, or to evaluate, the benefits and costs of the safe communities program. NHTSA's regional offices shall ensure that these funds are used to obtain scientifically valid evaluations and that the information derived from these evaluations are widely disseminated. NHTSA is expected to work cooperatively with the National Association of Governors' Highway Safety Representatives to ensure that a sufficient number of evaluations or reviews are conducted in a variety of local communities so that documentation of promising strategies and administrative arrangements are made available as soon possible. These analyses will provide an opportunity to test a diversity of approaches in different communities and to determine which approaches work best under various conditions. NHTSA will use this information to develop a safe communities implementation resource document that can be tailored by any community to meet its needs.

NHTSA has designed new performance-based procedures for the section 402 program which provide substantially more flexibility to State grantees. The Committee applauds this approach which substitutes a process-dominated system vigorously overseen by NHTSA to one that is outcome-based placing much more responsibility in the hands of the States. The Federal role will not be directive as to how results are obtained. Instead, performance goals and measurements set by the States will be of critical importance. The Committee commends NHTSA for taking several steps to improve the Federal/State partnership needed to promote traffic safety and looks forward to continued improvements in this area.

STEP projects.—Several States, working with NHTSA as part of the section 403 program, have demonstrated the effectiveness of highly publicized enforcement efforts (also called STEPS) that have resulted in significant increases in safety belt usage and reductions in alcohol-impaired driving. For example, North Carolina demonstrated that the "Click It or Ticket" campaign resulted in a dramatic 15 percentage point increase in safety belt usage in just a few weeks. These gains in highway safety were sustained with periodic followup activities. More recently, demonstrations conducted in six States (Oregon, Washington, New Mexico, South

Carolina, Vermont, and Indiana) have resulted in increases in safety belt usage that are much greater than the average changes in nondemonstration States. Similar programs have resulted in reductions in alcohol-impaired driving. The Committee finds these results compelling and urges NHTSA to work with States and local governments to encourage the use of section 402 funds (including funds provided for the safe communities program) to conduct similar STEP projects involving periodic, highly publicized enforcement to increase safety belt usage and to decrease alcohol-impaired driving. NHTSA regional and headquarters staff should provide data to various governmental entities showing the quantitative benefits of STEP enforcement and education campaigns and provide technical assistance when requested.

Younger driver set-aside.—NHTSA submitted substantial evidence, based on State data, of the benefits of the fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995 $8,000,000 set-aside to address the younger driver challenge to traffic safety. In addition, NHTSA reports that the States planned $21,100,000 of underage drinking and driving countermeasures in fiscal year 1994 and $21,700,000 in fiscal year 1995, increases of 210 and 220 percent, respectively, over the base level of funding of $10,000,000 of Federal grant funds spent during fiscal year 1993. In view of the continuing loss of life and numerous injuries resulting from the over involvement of younger drivers in traffic crashes, the Committee's allowance includes $8,000,000 for the States to develop and conduct comprehensive youth traffic safety programs, including combating drinking and driving, increasing seatbelt use, reducing speeding and other risk taking behavior, and furthering graduated licensing programs. Especially in those States without graduated licensing programs or zero tolerance laws, the Committee expects a portion of these funds to be used to work with concerned citizens and parents, State legislators, and administrators to promote such initiatives; to conduct relevant feasibility studies; or to defray startup costs implementing one or more of these elements of a State comprehensive younger driver program.

FORMULA GRANTS (SEC. 410)

The Committee proposes a total limitation of $25,000,000 for obligations to be incurred under the section 410 Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Program authorized under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991. The section 410 program has provided incentives to States to implement innovative strategies to reduce drunk and drugged driving, and constitutes an essential part in the Secretary's goal to reduce alcohol-related traffic deaths. To receive grants under the section 410 program, States must satisfy certain basic criteria established by Congress, including prompt license suspension, legal blood-alcohol content levels, sobriety checkpoints, self-sustaining community alcohol programs, mandatory sentencing, and control of access to alcohol by youth. Supplemental grant funding is available to States that meet additional criteria, including .02 BAC laws for drivers under age 21, open container laws, strict drugged driving prevention programs, and mandatory BAC testing programs. Section 410 grants funds may be used only to support programs to reduce impaired driving.

The bill includes language providing that $500,000 of the section 410 moneys shall be used for technical assistance. In fiscal year 1995 the entire amount of these funds was used as direct grants. Because this program continues to be oversubscribed, the Committee expects a similar allocation of technical assistance funds to be made directly to the States.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER

The National Driver Register [NDR] is a central repository of information on individuals whose licenses to operate a motor vehicle have been revoked, suspended, canceled, or denied. As authorized by Congress, the NDR has converted to an electronic problem driver pointer system to facilitate the decisionmaking by State driver licensing officials. NHTSA is preparing for transfer of certain NDR activities to a non-Federal entity. The NDR also contains information on persons who have been convicted of serious traffic-related violations such as driving while impaired by alcohol or other drugs. State driver licensing officials query the NDR when individuals apply for a license, for the purpose of determining whether driving privileges have been withdrawn by other States. Other organizations such as the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Railroad Administration also use NDR license data in hiring and certification decisions in overall U.S. transportation operations. The Committee has included a provision in the bill, subject to authorization, extending the authority to draw funds for the NDR from contract authority authorized for the section 402 program.

The bill includes an obligation limitation of $2,100,000 for the NDR, which is $300,000 below the administration's request. The Committee is most displeased that the Administrator has not submitted promised legislation to transfer certain NDR-related functions to a non-Federal entity. Such a transfer would have saved about $1,200,000 annually of funds for other critical traffic safety programs. NHTSA should submit this legislation before conference.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1996 PROGRAM

The Federal Railroad Administration [FRA] became an operating administration within the Department of Transportation on April 1, 1967. It incorporated the Bureau of Railroad Safety from the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation from the Department of Commerce, and the Alaska Railroad from the Department of the Interior. The Federal Railroad Administration is responsible for planning, developing, and administering programs to achieve safe operating and mechanical practices in the railroad industry. Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) and other financial assistance programs to rehabilitate and improve the railroad industry's physical plant are also administered by the Federal Railroad Administration.

The Committee recommends new appropriations and obligation limitations totaling $875,899,000 for the activities of the Federal Railroad Administration for fiscal year 1996. This is $321,522,000

less than the budget request and $47,958,000 more than the House allowance.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1995 enacted [1]	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Office of the Administrator	12,869	17,370	14,000	14,018
Transfer H.R. 1944	(612)			
Local rail freight assistance	17,000			
Rescission	−6,563			
Railroad safety	47,636	51,104	49,941	49,105
Railroad research and development	20,199	48,947	21,000	25,775
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program	200,000	[2] (235,000)	100,000	130,000
Alaska railroad rehabilitation				10,000
Rhode Island rail development	5,000	[2] (10,000)		2,000
Grants to Amtrak	[3] 793,500	[2] (750,000)	628,000	605,000
Next generation high-speed rail [4]	24,999	35,000	15,000	25,000
Penn Station redevelopment	40,000	[2] (50,000)		25,000
Rescission	(40,000)			
Railroad rehabilitation and improvement program				
Total	1,114,640	1,197,421	827,941	885,898

[1] Includes reductions pursuant to sections 323, 330, and 331 of Public Law 103–331 and amounts transferred to OST, salaries and expenses for civil rights activities.

[2] Funding included under UTIIP.

[3] Includes mandatory passenger rail service payments and a supplemental appropriation of $21,500,000.

[4] Includes obligation limitation on contract authority of $5,000,000 in 1995–96.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 1995	$12,869,100
(Transfer H.R. 1944)	(+612,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	17,370,000
House allowance	14,000,000
Committee recommendation	14,018,000

The Office of the Administrator provides support and guidance on issues concerning the railroad industry and the day-to-day operations of the Federal Railroad Administration. The appropriation includes budget activities related to executive direction and administration and policy support aimed at resolving problems facing the railroad industry. For the Office of the Administrator, the Committee provides $14,018,000. The amount provided is $3,352,000 less than the administration's request and $18,000 more than the House allowance.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee makes the following adjustments to the budget request for this appropriation:

	Changes
Reduce new technical assistance program	−$75,000
Reduce nonpay inflationary adjustment	−581,000
Reduce unobligated balances	−2,462,000
Training	−56,000
Inflation/vendor increases	−67,000
Other services	−91,000
Travel and transportation of things	−20,000
Net adjustment	−3,352,000

Technical assistance program.—The Committee provides $75,000 for this program, $55,000 more than that provided by the House, but $75,000 below the administration's request for an additional $150,000.

Nonpay inflationary adjustment.—Due to budget constraints, the Committee does not provide an additional $581,000 for nonpay inflation adjustments.

Unobligated balances.—The Committee has reduced the Office of the Administrator's request by $2,462,000 due to high unobligated balances which are available to fund programs under this account. The Committee understands that of these balances, $1,892,000 is reserved with respect to Union Station annual mortgage payments and $1,089,000 is reserved for possible Alaska Railroad liability payments.

Training.—The Committee reduces by $56,000 the budget request of $122,000 for training and restores the account to its actual expenditure amount during fiscal year 1994 of $66,000.

Inflation/vendor increases.—The Committee reduces by $67,000 the budget request for inflation or outside vendor increases associated with contract support.

Other services (information technology).—The Committee reduces the requested level by $91,000 to $600,000. This contract support account had been increased from an actual expenditure of $297,000 in fiscal year 1994 to $662,000 in fiscal year 1995.

Travel and transportation of persons.—The Committee reduces this account by $20,000 below the budget request for $258,000.

LOCAL RAIL FREIGHT ASSISTANCE

Appropriations, 1995	$17,000,000
Rescission	(6,563,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

The Local Rail Service Assistance Program was established by the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 to provide financial support to States for the continuation of rail freight service on abandoned light density lines in the Northeast. The Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 expanded the program to all States. In 1978 the program was further expanded and amended to allow capital assistance for rehabilitation prior to, rather than after, abandonment. Amendments in 1981 prohibited the use of these funds for operating subsidies.

The program was again reauthorized in 1989 under Public Law 101–213 and renamed the "Local Rail Freight Assistance Program" and then again reauthorized in 1993. The Committee has not provided any funds for this program which expired at the end of fiscal

year 1994. Congress has rescinded approximately 39 percent of the fiscal year 1995 appropriation.

The Committee, however, recognizes the unique needs of local freight railroads and the important services they provide. Therefore, the Committee has appropriated funds under a separate account to support a low interest, federally guaranteed loan program to local freight railroads.

RAILROAD SAFETY

Appropriations, 1995	$47,636,000
Budget estimate, 1996	51,104,000
House allowance	49,940,660
Committee recommendation	49,105,000

This appropriation finances the development, administration, and enforcement of programs designed to achieve safe operating and mechanical practices in the railroad industry.

The Committee recommends a $49,105,000 program level for the Railroad Safety Program. This is $1,999,000 less than the budget request and $835,660 less than the House allowance.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request:

Reduce other services by 2 percent	−$105,340
Reduce labor/management project	−350,000
Reduce educational and technical assistance	−60,000
Delete nonpay inflationary adjustment	−453,000
Reduce salaries and expenses	−740,000
Inspector trainee program	−50,000
Automated track inspection program [ATIP]	−100,000
Permanent change of station moves	−140,660
Net adjustment	−1,999,000

Other services.—The Committee recommends $5,161,660 for other services, the same as the House, due to budget constraints. This is an increase of $130,660 over fiscal year 1995 and a 2-percent cut from the budget request.

Labor/management project.—Because of budgetary constraints and questions regarding the appropriate balance between enforcement-related functions and cooperative initiatives, the Committee recommends $50,000 for support of the labor/management safety project, which is $350,000 below the amount requested, but $50,000 more than the House allowance.

Supplies, materials, and equipment costs.—The Committee disagrees with the House reductions to supplies and materials and equipment costs, and recommends $800,000 requested by the administration for the information technology pilot project.

Small railroads educational and technical assistance.—The fiscal year 1996 budget request includes $80,000 to provide educational and technical assistance to small railroads. The Committee has reduced this funding to $20,000. FRA inspects these railroads annually and explains the regulations to company managers and employees. Although these inspections will still continue, budgetary limitations necessitate a reduction in the amount of funds used for educational materials and technical assistance.

Salaries and expenses.—The Committee notes the growth in this account since fiscal year 1994, and reduces it by $740,000.

Other reductions.—Because of budget constraints, the Committee has reduced funds for trainees, ATIP, and transfer expenses.

Safety initiatives.—The Committee commends FRA's substantial efforts to improve the reporting of accidents, casualties, and highway-rail grade crossing accidents. Information supplied by industry is of critical importance in strengthening the effectiveness and targeting of FRA's inspection and enforcement activities. The proposed improvement in reporting requirements, the additional flexibility provided to industry, and the refinement of reporting thresholds are all worthy objectives. The Committee fully supports FRA's effort to increase the accuracy and consistency of its accident/incident data base and expects FRA to pursue completion of the necessary regulatory changes expeditiously. Final regulations should be issued before next year's hearing.

FRA also should expeditiously complete cost-effective regulations pertaining to the general revision of the power brake rule, safety of roadway workers, general revision of track safety standards, and tank car crashworthiness. FRA expects to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking on passenger equipment standards in fiscal year 1996 and a final rule by November 1997. In view of the importance of this action, the Committee expects FRA to hold to this schedule. This action would be consistent with the Swift Rail Development Act of 1994, which requires FRA to issue initial passenger equipment safety standards by November 1997. In combination these various regulatory initiatives will improve railroad safety and eliminate millions of dollars of medical and liability claims and property damages.

The Committee acknowledges the substantial increases in the number of tank cars inspected, operating practice reviews, and signals inspected. The Committee looks forward to reviewing similar improvements in other inspection areas, especially when such inspections are guided by the national inspection plan and other management strategies. The Committee also acknowledges the closer and improved relationships of FRA inspectors to the hazardous materials response community, improvement in grade crossing and trespasser programs, increased attention to hazmat shippers, and improvement in the handling of complaints from industry.

Grade crossing safety.—The Committee supports actions taken by FRA to improve grade crossing safety and looks forward to reviewing other accomplishments of these key FRA staff next year. However, FRA inspectors could make additional contributions to highway/rail grade crossing safety.

During the last few years, FRA has been unable to achieve its goal of encouraging each of its inspectors to participate in at least four Operation Lifesaver [OL]-related activities each year. In fact, during fiscal year 1994, FRA inspectors met only 45 percent of the agency's goal regarding inspector participation in this program. Although FRA is pursuing many different approaches to improve grade crossing safety, the Committee considers increased inspector participation in OL activities essential. At next year's hearing, the Administrator should be prepared to report on progress indicating

that FRA is well on its way toward meeting at least 75 percent of the agency's OL goal.

Multiple safety offices.—The Committee notes that in some States FRA has three inspector offices and in one State there are four FRA offices. The Committee believes that such expenditures are unnecessary. The FRA Administrator is directed to take the necessary steps to limit the number of FRA offices to no more than two in any State. These closures should occur as soon as possible, certainly before October 1, 1996. If FRA judges it imperative that a State have more than two offices, the Committee expects to receive a letter justifying such a decision.

Enforcement effectiveness and vitality.—FRA data show that, by a variety of measures, railroad safety continues to improve. This improvement is a tribute to the efforts of industry, labor, and FRA. FRA's enforcement program has certainly been a contributor to the substantial improvements in railroad safety during the last 10 or more years. The Committee wants to ensure that the effectiveness and vitality of this program increases, while the Agency builds a more cooperative relationship with industry and labor.

The Committee, however, is becoming increasingly concerned that FRA may be reducing the effectiveness and vitality of its enforcement program. FRA submitted fiscal year 1994 data showing that the amount of assessed and collected civil penalties declined significantly from fiscal years 1992–93. For example, FRA data show that the amount collected in fiscal years 1992–94 was roughly $16,700,000, $15,600,000, and $8,000,000, respectively.

During the fiscal year 1994 inspection program, FRA collected the least amount of civil penalties since before fiscal year 1990. Although this decline is said to be due to a reduction in the enforcement case backlog, FRA continues to sustain a backlog of some $20,000,000 in potential civil penalties.

While achieving compliance with the safety regulations is a primary objective, the number of enforcement cases prosecuted each year and the total amount of civil penalties collected each year sends a message to industry and labor about the rigor of FRA's enforcement program. A strong FRA enforcement program catalyzes voluntary compliance.

Senior FRA staff indicated that a reduction in the number of civil penalty cases and collections is likely to continue in view of a new FRA program announced in March 1995. This Safety Assurance and Compliance Program emphasizes assessment of systemwide problems over routine inspections and also emphasizes cooperative partnerships over enforcement.

The Committee supports the intent of the new policy to focus on root causes of noncompliance and to focus enforcement actions on serious problems. One of the components of the new FRA compliance strategy is to hold in abeyance the collection of large amounts of potential civil penalties against a company that is not in compliance with the safety regulations. FRA intends to monitor closely whether such a company comes into compliance. If the company does, the enforcement case is typically not pursued, provided that no imminently hazardous violation occurs. If the company fails to make prompt improvement in its compliance with the safety regulations, FRA will assess civil penalties both for the original in-

stances of violation and the subsequent violation counts documented through followup.

The Committee recognizes the potential value of this approach in promoting partnerships while gaining maximum value from enforcement powers. However, the Committee expects that FRA will closely control use of this approach, employing followup inspections to ensure that improvements in compliance are prompt and sustained. Further, the Committee is concerned that this approach not be viewed by the railroads as an entitlement. Holding penalties in abeyance for widespread noncompliance, by a railroad that has repeatedly been cited for intentional or frequent violations of the same subject matter, would be counterproductive and should not be a routine compliance strategy.

Although a cooperative relationship with industry and labor will, in some cases, promote compliance with the safety regulations, FRA must not forego its strong enforcement role, especially when the public's safety is at risk. As FRA admits, "Of course, broad acceptance of this partnership principle is based on the entire industry's participation." FRA knows from experience that some railroads are more likely to cooperate and comply with the safety regulations than others. FRA's commitment to quality customer service should mean more than joining in partnerships with rail industry and labor to promote compliance.

The Committee asserts that it will be too late to shift the pendulum more toward enforcement after a major railroad accident. As it implements its new compliance strategy, FRA must effectively use the enforcement authorities provided for in the Rail Safety Acts of 1970, 1988, and 1992. These acts provided the FRA with definitive enforcement authorities that have been time-tested and proven successful.

To this end, the Committee requests the FRA Administrator to prepare a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before May 1, 1996, that assesses the benefits of its new enforcement posture and documents evidence that a vigorous enforcement program is still being conducted by FRA, while it simultaneously seeks cooperation from regulated entities.

FRA should submit documentation proving that there is an appropriate balance between the resources used to promote cooperation and educational assistance and those used for enforcement. The report should detail improvements, or lack thereof, in compliance for each of the railroads for which FRA approved a safety action plan.

The Committee will carefully review this report, changes in FRA's enforcement posture, and various measures of enforcement productivity as part of next year's hearing process when it considers staffing needs and funding requirements.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1995	$20,199,000
Budget estimate, 1996	48,947,000
House allowance	21,000,000
Committee recommendation	25,775,000

The Federal Railroad Administration's Railroad Research and Development Program provides for research in the development of

safety and performance standards for high speed rail and the evaluation of their role in the Nation's transportation infrastructure. The program also provides support for the Deputy Associate Administrator for Technology Development and the staff of the Office of Research and Development.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $25,775,000 for railroad research and development. The amount provided is $23,172,000 less than the President's request and $4,775,000 more than the House allowance.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommended funding levels for the railroad research and development subaccounts are displayed below, compared to the fiscal year 1996 budget request and the House allowance.

	Fiscal year 1996 request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Equipment, operations, and hazardous materials	$5,010,000	$5,010,000	$6,163,000
Track, structures, and train control	8,082,000	8,082,000	7,082,000
High speed ground transportation	33,225,000	5,378,000	10,000,000
R&D facilities	400,000	400,000	400,000
Administration	2,230,000	2,130,000	2,130,000
Total	48,947,000	21,000,000	25,775,000

Equipment, operations, and hazardous materials.—Consistent with the authorization level specified in the 1994 Rail Safety Act and the intent of the Department's grade crossing action plan, the Committee has increased funding for Operation Lifesaver to $500,000, which is $350,000 above the requested amount. This increase reflects the Committee's concern that more needs to be done to address safety at railroad crossings. Railroad crossings are claiming an average of about 600 deaths per year, far in excess of the average number of deaths among railroad employees and passengers per year. However, the FRA concentrates most of its safety budget on efforts to improve safety for railroad employees and passengers. While railroad work can be difficult and dangerous, additional money spent on grade crossing safety certainly will be well spent.

On June 8, 1995, an Amtrak passenger train traveling at about 70 to 79 miles-per-hour hit a pickup truck at a rural crossing in Nyssa, OR, killing seven farm workers in the truck. This terrible accident occurred at 5:25 a.m., as the victims were on their way to work in the fields. This crossing is marked only by a stop sign. Although this accident occurred in clear weather, it underscores the fact that trains require long distances in which to come to a complete stop even when obstacles on the track can be seen.

In addition, the Committee's allowance includes an increase of $803,000 above the amount requested to strengthen the human factors component of the operating practices research program. This research activity seeks to address human error in railroad operations, which is judged the cause of roughly one-third of all railroad accidents. The additional funds recommended will allow for

continued work on FRA's 5-year-strategic plan on operating practices that was prepared at the request of the Committee, and address fundamental problems such as fatigue, stress, and various sociological problems affecting rail safety.

Track, structures and train control.—The Committee recommends $7,082,000 for track, structures, and train control, which is $1,000,000 less than the amount requested. Some of the activities funded in this category directly benefit the economic productivity of the railroad industry, as well as promote safety objectives. Increased cost sharing with the private sector would be desirable.

High speed ground transportation.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for the high speed rail ground transportation program, including $3,800,000 to provide technical support for monitoring, assessing, and issuing regulations to ensure the safety of high speed rail systems.

—*Magnetic levitation [maglev] systems.*—The Committee has deleted $825,000 for maglev safety research and development due to highly uncertain prospects for near-term commercialization and budgetary limitations. If and when substantial non-Federal investments in a commercial or prototype maglev systems are made, the Committee will reconsider the need for funding safety R&D related to this technology. FRA should continue its work on developing the regulatory base for a future maglev industry by analyzing the wealth of information previously collected. FRA has sufficient funds and experience to be able to evaluate the safety dynamics of any serious proposal submitted for Federal review.

—*Toll-free grade crossing malfunction emergency notification system.*—Section 301 of the 1994 Rail Safety Act requires the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a pilot program to demonstrate an emergency notification system utilizing a toll-free telephone number that the public can use to convey information about malfunctions or other safety problems at railroad-highway grade crossings. Implementation of the system will involve building and maintaining current data bases which contain information from the AAR/DOT National Highway-Rail Crossing Inventory and contact information on railroad and public safety telephone numbers.

Consistent with FRA's intention to fund this pilot program out of the funds provided for high speed rail R&D, the Committee recommends that $625,000 shall be used for this pilot program, instead of the $725,000 that FRA stated would be necessary for initiation and first year funding for the system. Funds have not been provided to contract for the mandated report on the results of this pilot program. This report should be completed by FRA staff. This amount also does not include funds for signage and its deployment. FRA anticipates that expenses for these activities would be paid for by the participating States using highway funds. FRA will design the pilot program to ensure that information on grade crossings located in both high speed and conventional train corridors is included.

—*High-speed positive train separation.*—The Committee's recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the State of Oregon to develop high-speed positive train separation with flexible block

control capabilities, including an extension into the Union Station area, and for additional track and signal work. No matching funds shall be required for this project. FRA maintains "it is likely that insufficient capacity will exist on some corridors unless flexible block dispatching can be implemented, rather than relying on fixed signal locations as are presently employed." Furthermore, FRA asserts that the Pacific Northwest corridor, with both willing and interested freight railroads and States willing and interested in supporting high-speed passenger operations, is the ideal testbed for such a system. The funds recommended will accomplish the following objective in fiscal year 1996: modeling and analysis, flexible block architecture, braking algorithms, communications development, and track and signal improvements.

Cost sharing.—By March 1, 1996, FRA shall submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a letter indicating efforts taken to further increased cost-sharing (both cash and in-kind services) needed to sustain a vigorous railroad R&D program. Specific efforts taken in each of the specific components, for example, truck, structures, and hazmat, of the program will be delineated.

Public input into FRA's R&D agenda.—The Committee suggests that FRA consider holding a series of public meetings to outline the scope, direction, and results of its research and development program and to gain input into the needed direction for future activities.

Oregon Graduate Institute [OGI].—The Committee has continued the provision providing the FRA with explicit grant authority with the Oregon Graduate Institute. The OGI has been identified as a national resource for research in rail metallurgy. The administration continues to support its unique grant arrangement with the OGI for research on surface and subsurface initiated fatigue defects in rail steel.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1995	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 1996	[1](235,000,000)
House allowance	100,000,000
Committee recommendation	130,000,000

[1] This account is proposed to be replaced by funding through the Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP].

Title VII of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, as amended, created the Northeast corridor improvement project [NECIP] to upgrade and modernize the rail corridor between Washington, DC, and Boston, MA, the most heavily used rail passenger corridor in the Nation. NECIP funds are appropriated to the Secretary. Since 1985, however, the actual responsibility for carrying out the improvement project was transferred to Amtrak.

NECIP is the primary capital funding source for the Northeast corridor. It has made possible the Nation's only high-speed rail passenger service, with speeds between New York and Washington of 125 miles per hour and regularly scheduled travel time in as low as 2 hours and 40 minutes. Work is underway to reduce travel time between New York and Boston to under 3 hours. The Northeast

corridor is used by some 210 million commuter passengers and 11 million intercity rail travelers each year who otherwise would be forced to travel by car or air on the region's heavily congested highways and airports.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee has provided $130,000,000 for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program. The amount provided is $105,000,000 less than the administration's request of $235,000,000 within UTIIP, $70,000,000 less than the fiscal year 1995 comparable appropriation, $30,000,000 more than the House allowance, and $105,000,000 less than Amtrak's request.

Amtrak has requested $235,000,000 for improvements on the Northeast corridor related to two areas: high-speed rail infrastructure improvements between New York and Boston required to achieve 3 hour trip time; and recapitalization of the Northeast corridor (particularly between New York and Washington), required to bring the railroad and its conventional rail passenger equipment to a state of good repair. The Committee has not provided any additional funding for acquisition of high-speed trainsets.

The administration requested funding in the amount of $235,000,000, primarily directed to New York-Boston high-speed rail improvements and the acquisition of high-speed trainsets. The House provided a total of $100,000,000. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $130,000,000, of which $65,000,000 is for recapitalization of the Northeast corridor, and $65,000,000 is to progress the New York-Boston high-speed rail program. Last year, following passage of the Transportation Appropriations Act, Amtrak advised the Committee that it would apply the funds differently than identified in its grant request. The Committee expects Amtrak to follow congressional direction on the use of funds and to seek the approval of the Committee to reprogram funds in the event priorities change.

Northeast corridor recapitalization.—The administration requested $35,000,000 for improvements between New York and Washington. The House included $79,300,000. The Committee has included $65,000,000 for critical near-term recapitalization work.

The Committee is extremely concerned that Amtrak and the FRA have not adequately advised Congress of the alarming need for capital improvements for the New York-Washington segment of the corridor. The Committee directs the FRA to work with Amtrak to prepare a joint transportation plan for the New York-Washington segment of the corridor, similar to the transportation plan completed in 1994 for the New York-Boston segment of the rail line. The Committee is especially concerned about the safety of the New York-New Jersey tunnels, which must receive thorough review. Most tunnels are over 80 years old and handle some 750 trains daily. By the year 2010, over 900 trains will use these tunnels each day. The plan should detail the state of the rail line, the investments necessary for its recapitalization (including an allocation of costs between Amtrak and the commuter authorities using the Northeast corridor), and the capacity improvements required to grow the railroad to meet the needs of intercity and commuter passenger rail service over the next two decades. The plan should

identify how the costs for upgrading and maintaining the railroad will be shared by users of the rail line. Moreover, the plan must include the projected timing for when expenditures will be needed. A copy of this plan shall be submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations by March 1, 1996.

New York-Boston high-speed rail improvements.—The administration requested $120,000,000 to progress the New York-Boston improvements. The House included $20,700,000. The Committee recommends $65,000,000 for electrification, environmental mitigation, and infrastructure improvements included in the project.

Congress increased NECIP funding beginning in fiscal year 1991 to undertake a program of infrastructure improvements required to reduce New York-Boston trip time to under 3 hours. The program includes electrification of the rail line between New Haven and Boston, which is essential for faster speeds and increased acceleration, and modernization of the railroad infrastructure and signal system to permit speeds of up to 150 miles per hour. It also includes a number of projects to eliminate bottlenecks in heavily traveled commuter territories in Connecticut, New York, and Massachusetts.

The project offers significant environmental and economic benefits to a region with highways and airports at or beyond capacity. It also is expected to play a major role in Amtrak's ability to generate an operating surplus from its Northeast corridor operations. Faster and more frequent train service is expected to more than double current ridership, providing a critical alternative to accommodate growth in regional transportation. Significant air quality and energy benefits also will result with electrification of the tracks, helping States in the Northeast meet Clean Air Act requirements and reduce the need for imported oil. The Committee has been informed that Amtrak will complete a new ridership and demand forecast study in September which is expected to verify and update previous ridership analyses. According to Amtrak, preliminary results indicate that previous ridership projections are conservative.

Congress has already provided nearly $600,000,000 of the total $1,000,000,000 required to complete electrification and the other infrastructure work and environmental mitigation necessary to achieve 3 hour service. Major track, signal, bridge, and infrastructure design projects are currently underway. The total project costs includes some $200,000,000 in additional work recently imposed by the FRA to mitigate environmental and rail line capacity issues. Amtrak expects to complete the electrification design in October and construction work will begin immediately thereafter. Electrified operations are planned to begin in 1999.

High-speed trainsets.—The administration requested $80,000,000 in fiscal year 1996 for high-speed trainsets and facilities. The House did not include funding for this purpose. The Committee has not included additional funding for trainsets because it believes that Amtrak is poised to move forward in the near future to advance the trainset procurement.

Amtrak's current Metroliner fleet is now 20 years old and is reaching retirement age. The fleet of AEM–7 locomotives are experiencing a growing number of mechanical failures and this is in-

creasingly undermining reliability, trip time, and on-time performance. In addition, Amtrak must procure additional trains in order to increase service to Boston following completion of electrification. The acquisition of new high-speed trainsets, capable of speeds up to 150 miles per hour, will enable Amtrak to replace and modernize its Metroliner fleet. New trainsets will also permit Amtrak to reduce trip time on the Northeast corridor and reduce operating and maintenance costs associated with the current antiquated fleet. Amtrak requested proposals for 26 trainsets, which include two fossil fuel trains, in September 1994 and expects to complete negotiations leading to award of a contract in October 1995. Three vendor teams are actively competing for the procurement contract.

The Committee is concerned that Amtrak may opt to defer the trainset acquisition in favor of other capital needs. This would be a mistake. If Amtrak is to have a future on the Northeast corridor, it must reduce trip time and provide its passengers modern and reliable trains in which to travel. The Committee directs Amtrak to provide a detailed cash flow analysis of required funding to complete the trainset procurement, and an accompanying report on options for public and private financing of the procurement, within 30 days of enactment of this act.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING FUNDS

(RAILROAD CREDIT ENHANCEMENT)

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation (loan guarantee authority)	.....

Section 511 of Public Law 94–210, as amended (the 4–R Act) authorizes obligation guarantees for meeting the long-term needs of the railroads. Railroads utilize this funding mechanism to finance major new facilities and rehabilitation or consolidation of current facilities. The Committee has not provided any new appropriations to subsidize new loan guarantee commitments under this program.

The Committee, however, has included a general provision in the bill, to create State infrastructure banks [SIB] that will be able to provide loans to freight railroads, as well as provide them with a wide array of innovative financial assistance. Funds have been appropriated in the bill to support the establishment of the SIB program, which is strongly supported by the administration. SIB's will be structured to assist transportation infrastructure projects, including freight rail activities, and will provide loans; finance various forms of credit enhancement; assist in the acquisition or lease of rolling stock for the purpose of lease pooling; provide backstop financing for construction loans; pool debt issuances; and refinance of outstanding debt; and many other financing programs.

The SIB's will provide a much broader array of modern financial tools to freight railroads than the section 511 loan guaranty program. Given the Committee's extremely limited funds, it cannot fund the 511 program, whose single purpose will be covered within the larger, and more innovative SIB program.

NEXT GENERATION HIGH-SPEED RAIL

(INCLUDING TRUST FUNDS)

	General	Trust[1]	Total
Appropriations, 1995	$19,999,000	$5,000,000	$24,999,000
Budget estimate, 1996	30,000,000	5,000,000	35,000,000
House allowance	10,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000	5,000,000	25,000,000

[1] Limitation on obligations.

The Committee has provided $20,000,000 in general fund appropriations for the high-speed ground transportation [HSGT] program. This amount, in combination with the $5,000,000 provided in trust fund appropriations, yields a total Committee recommendation of $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1996. The amount provided is $10,000,000 more than the House allowance and $10,000,000 less than the administration's request.

The Committee first provided funding for the Next Generation High-Speed Rail Program in fiscal year 1995. The program is authorized by the Swift Rail Development Act which was enacted in 1994. The Committee commends the progress the Department has made in implementing this new program and recognizes the promise that the program holds for reducing the costs of high-speed rail service, thus expediting its implementation in the United States.

FRA has entered into a variety of projects to advance various high-speed rail [HSR] technologies. The Committee maintains that it is critical to complete the final development, testing, and demonstration of these projects that were begun in fiscal year 1995. These include the following:

	Fiscal year 1996 request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Advanced train control	$10,000,000	$9,000,000	$9,000,000
Nonelectric locomotive	15,500,000	.....	9,500,000
Grade crossing hazards	7,000,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Corridor planning	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,545,000
Administrative	500,000	500,000	455,000
Total[1]	35,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000

[1] Includes $5,000,000 in limitation on obligation from the highway trust fund.

Advanced train control.—FRA awarded a $6,080,000 grant to Michigan in March 1995, to initiate a project to demonstrate advanced train control on 44 miles of track on the Detroit-Chicago corridor. This innovative project seeks to demonstrate significantly improved grade crossing protection, positive train control, and substantially higher speeds on the line. The Committee's allowance includes $3,000,000, which is needed to complete installation of this system. FRA also will soon award a grant, using fiscal year 1995 funds, of $1,000,000 to Illinois to begin a demonstration of advanced train control system [ATCS] on a segment of the Chicago-St. Louis corridor. The Committee's allowance includes $6,000,000 to advance this ATCS demonstration of a full central command control system using modern radio communications.

Nonelectric locomotives.—The Committee disagrees with the recommendation of the House to eliminate the advancement of nonelectric locomotives as part of the Next Generation HSR Program. Success in providing commercially available, reliable nonelectric locomotives capable of 125 to 150 miles per hour would reduce HSR implementation cost by approximately $2,000,000 to $3,000,000 per mile by avoiding the need for electrification. Both Amtrak and FRA agree that additional refinements and testing are necessary to provide a reliable, maintenance-efficient, nonelectric locomotive capable of the high acceleration necessary for HSR service. As the FRA report on the Albany-Schenectady project indicates, the retrofit of these turbine engines successfully demonstrate a top speed of 125 miles per hour. But, the demonstration also indicated that additional work is necessary to address the issues of acceleration, reliability, and maintainability, which are key to successful HSR service in nonelectric powered fleet operations. The favorable public reaction to the demonstration train in revenue service, leads to the conclusion that additional enhanced and upgraded remanufacture of high-speed train sets will further nonelectric high-speed rail development objectives. Given the uncertainty of the market for high-speed, nonelectric locomotives, the Committee maintains that the private sector alone is unlikely to address the many remaining technical issues confronting the innovation of high-speed nonelectric locomotives. Thus, these constraints are appropriately addressed through the Next Generation HSR Program. Consequently, the Committee has provided $6,000,000 for continuation of this program of development, testing, and demonstration of turbine powered nonelectric locomotives including in fleet operation in New York. The Committee directs FRA to ensure that these funds be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis. FRA should be prepared to report next year on the results of the demonstration with particular emphasis on maintainability, reliability, fuel consumption, and operating and maintenance costs.

FRA obligated $3,000,000 in fiscal year 1995 to upgrade the high-speed test track at its Transportation Technology Center in Pueblo, CO. This work is necessary to expedite final testing of new and innovative equipment before it is put into revenue service. Otherwise, such tests would need to be done on lines in revenue service, thus disrupting service or maintenance work. The upgrade will include catenary work and track work to enable tests to 150 miles per hour and the capability for testing innovative work on grade crossing hazards. The Committee's allowance includes $3,500,000 to advance this work to enable testing of Northeast corridor high speed transits in fiscal year 1997 and other high speed equipment as necessary.

Grade crossing hazards and other innovative technologies.—FRA will make grants in fiscal year 1995 totaling $1,300,000 for grade crossing and other innovative projects in Delaware, Virginia, Idaho, and elsewhere across the Nation to enable higher speeds without compromising safety. Advanced train control systems will monitor and communicate train locations and speeds and will stop the train if the crossing is not clear. For example, four quadrant gates block all highway lanes and provide increased protection with existing technology. Movable barriers will protect crossings which cannot be

closed. The Committee's allowance includes $1,000,000 to complete these projects and $3,500,000 to conduct a multifaceted demonstration of innovative techniques for eliminating crossing hazards in a high-speed corridor. Success in this area is essential for effective, safe high-speed rail service.

Corridor planning.—Section 26101 of the Swift Rail Development Act authorizes a corridor planning assistance program to advance high-speed rail systems. The Committee recommends $1,545,000 to implement this section of the act. Eligible activities include feasibility studies, economic analyses, assessment of community economic impacts, operational planning, route selection analysis, and right-of-way acquisition. These funds will provide additional leveraging opportunities to advance high-speed rail systems in the United States. The resolution of nontechnical as well as technical challenges is essential for the implementation of high-speed rail systems in the United States.

Corridor development.—The House Appropriations Committee has addressed corridor risk analytical model development under the "Railroad research and development" account. However, this program received $300,000 within the "Railroad safety" account in fiscal year 1995. With these funds, FRA has begun evaluating advanced train control and other system enhancements in various proposed high-speed rail corridors, including Detroit to Chicago, Chicago to St. Louis, and Seattle to Portland. The Committee strongly disagrees with the House directive for FRA to submit its corridor risk analysis development plan before initiating further corridor development work outside the Northeast corridor. Such efforts in corridors outside the Northeast should not be delayed while awaiting an FRA report.

NAS study.—The Committee directs FRA to request the National Academy of Sciences [NAS] to assemble a panel of experts who will guide and help integrate each of the components of FRA's high-speed rail program. Unlike the House proposal, the Committee believes that this request should be for ongoing advice for the entire period of Federal investment in high-speed rail technology. This panel will offer periodic advice and guidance on the management, coordination, and direction of the program. Therefore, the Committee's allowance includes sufficient funds for the NAS to improve the structure, focus, and nature of: (1) the ongoing high-speed rail safety and technology research and development program, (2) the Next Generation Technology Program, (3) the integration of the research and development program with the demonstration activity, and (4) other Federal policies and programs to promote high-speed rail corridor planning and implementation, including project-level planning, engineering, and operational analyses.

The Committee expects that the strategic guidance provided by the NAS panel would promote the likelihood that the advances derived from the FRA-sponsored program are deployed in future State or private sector high-speed rail projects. The NAS would support FRA by selecting recognized experts from various stakeholder groups and by coordinating review activities to assure optimum program direction and results. The NAS panel would be expected to issue progress reports to the Department, with copies forwarded to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

The panel also should consider whether a private-sector led consortium, similar to that established to plan and conduct a prototype test of the advanced highway system, or some other management structure should be formed to conduct the various components of the high-speed rail initiative on behalf of or in association with the FRA starting in fiscal year 1998.

ALASKA RAILROAD REHABILITATION

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	$10,000,000

The Committee has included $10,000,000 for capital rehabilitation and improvements benefiting passenger operations of the Alaska railroad. This railroad extends 470 miles from Seward through Anchorage, the largest city in Alaska, to the interior town of Fairbanks. It carries both passengers and freight, and provides a critical transportation link for passengers and cargo traveling through difficult terrain and harsh climatic conditions. Subzero temperatures in the region result in frost-heaving of the railbed, and require costly repairs and reinvestment. The Committee notes that rehabilitation work on the Alaska railroad is more expensive per mile than for most other railroads due to its location.

PENNSYLVANIA STATION REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Appropriations, 1995	[1] $40,000,000
Rescission	(40,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	[2] (50,000,000)
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	25,000,000

[1] $40,000,000 was rescinded in Public Law 104–6, but provided $21,500,000 for emergency, life safety needs under Amtrak's capital grant.
[2] This account is proposed to be replaced by funding through the Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP].

The Committee has provided $25,000,000 for redevelopment of Pennsylvania Station in New York City in fiscal year 1996. This is $25,000,000 less than the administration's request. The project was authorized for appropriation in the National Highway System Designation Act, Senate bill 440, which passed the Senate on June 22, 1995. The House did not provide funds for the project.

The Committee is pleased that the State and the city of New York have proven their financial commitments to this project, with $75,000,000 and $25,000,000 budgeted respectively. The Governor of New York State is chartering a State-subsidiary corporation, the Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Corp., to oversee the financing and redevelopment of the station. The Committee believes that establishing a separate entity to manage this major undertaking is a prudent step that will help ensure the project's success, and the careful management of the investment being made by all governmental partners. It is structured with a board of directors consisting of two State, two city, and two Federal representatives. For fiscal year 1996, State and local cost sharing is already in place, demonstrating the importance of the project to the non-Federal parties. Total project financing leverages the Federal grant by a factor of 3 to 1.

Tenant leases and audit activities.—The Committee has been informed by Amtrak that references in the House report to various deficiencies uncovered by inspector general reviews are extremely misleading. In fact, the Committee understands that these audits were requested by Amtrak's new Commercial Development Department in an effort to correct matters of longstanding duration and that appropriate remedial actions have been taken.

The Pennsylvania Station redevelopment project will provide New York City a gateway station with a modern facility to better serve Amtrak ridership.

RHODE ISLAND RAIL DEVELOPMENT

Appropriations, 1995	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 1996	[1](10,000,000)
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	2,000,000

[1] This account is proposed to be replaced by funding through the Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP].

For fiscal year 1995, Congress appropriated $5,000,000 to fund construction of a third track on the Northeast corridor between Davisville and Central Falls, RI, with sufficient clearance to accommodate double stack freight cars. The appropriation act stipulated that the State of Rhode Island or its designee provide matching funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis, and that the Providence & Worcester [P&W] Railroad, which would benefit from the third track, enter into an agreement with the Secretary to reimburse Amtrak and/or FRA up to $5,000,000 for damages stemming from certain potential legal actions brought by the P&W.

For fiscal year 1996, the administration proposes to continue funding this project, with a dollar-for-dollar matching requirement of the State of Rhode Island or its designee and a requirement that the P&W enter into an agreement with the Secretary to reimburse Amtrak and/or FRA up to $15,000,000 for damages stemming from certain potential legal actions brought by the P&W. The Committee is providing $2,000,000 to continue the Rhode Island rail development project.

GRANTS TO NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK)

Appropriations, 1995	[1]$772,000,000
Supplemental	21,500,000
Budget estimate, 1996	[2](750,000,000)
House allowance	628,000,000
Committee recommendation	605,000,000

[1] Includes $150,000,000 for mandatory passenger rail payments displayed as a separate account in fiscal year 1994.

[2] This account is proposed to be replaced by funding through the Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP].

The National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) was established in 1971 to preserve and improve the Nation's intercity rail passenger system. Federal assistance, in the form of operating and capital grants, has been provided since Amtrak's inception through the Department of Transportation. Over its 23-year existence, Amtrak has succeeded in vastly improving the economics of

intercity rail passenger operations and in expanding the demand for and quality of service.

The Committee has provided a total funding level of $605,000,000 for Amtrak. This is $23,000,000 less than the House appropriation and $167,000,000 below the fiscal year 1995 Amtrak appropriation. The administration's request for Amtrak funding was included in the UTIIP proposal at $975,000,000 (it rises to $1,035,000,000 if the Farley Building is included). Amtrak's budget request was for a total of $1,010,000 (Amtrak's request totaled $1,060,000,000 with the Farley Building included).

The Senate and House budget resolutions call for Amtrak capital needs to be funded, but would phase out Amtrak's operating subsidy over the life of the resolution. Amtrak has already undertaken plans for significant restructuring of the corporation. Broadening and deepening its revenue streams are vital to the railroad's commitment to wean itself from dependency on Federal operating aid. The Committee appreciates Amtrak's efforts to improve its fiscal health. However, Amtrak's future depends, in large measure, on the success of its restructuring plans and on Federal legislative action.

Amtrak's fiscal year 1995 strategic and business plan, announced in December 1994, calls for reductions of 5,600 FTE's (full time equivalent) on an annual basis. For the period October 1994 through May 1995, 1,548 people left Amtrak's payroll. The plan would restructure Amtrak's route network and improve productivity. Amtrak expects the actions to reduce operating expenses by about $200,000,000 in 1995, and ultimately cut such expenses by about $430 million annually. However, Amtrak estimates that about $21,000,000 of the $200,000,000 it plans to save in 1995 is dependent upon collective bargaining and/or legislative change. Although legislation to reform Amtrak is under consideration in congress, to date, no bills have been passed.

It is clear, however, that Amtrak remains reliant on Federal capital investment to help produce greater operating efficiencies, reduce maintenance needs, and improve revenues. Meeting these capital needs present great challenges to the Committee.

OPERATIONS

	Fiscal year 1996 request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Routine operating expenses	$300,000,000	$216,000,000	$185,000,000
Mandatory passenger rail payments	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000
Transition and restructuring costs	100,000,000	62,000,000	100,000,000

The Committee has provided $305,000,000 for operations, while the House provided $336,000,000 for this account. Amtrak has requested $260,000,000 for operations, a reduction of $135,000,000 below its fiscal year 1995 appropriation for operations. Amtrak indicates that its ability to continue to reduce operating expenses depends on Federal capital aid of at least $500,000,000 (including both ordinary capital for Amtrak and Northeast corridor funds).

Mandatory passenger rail payments.—This appropriations includes $120,000,000 for mandatory passenger rail service pay-

ments, as requested by the administration. These payments are made by Amtrak into the railroad retirement fund and the "Railroad unemployment insurance" account. Amtrak has not requested these funds which it believes may total as much as $135,000,000 and contends that the responsibility to meet these payments lies elsewhere in the Federal budget. The Committee appreciates the fiscal relief Amtrak could achieve if these payments were deleted from its expenses. However, without new legislative direction on this point the Committee must continue to make these funds available.

Transition and restructuring costs.—The Committee has provided $100,000,000 in transition costs, the same as the administration's request and $38,000,000 above the House appropriation. These funds will assist Amtrak in meeting the varied costs, many of them personnel costs, associated with streamlining and restructuring the corporation.

CAPITAL EXPENSES

The Committee has provided $200,000,000 for capital grants, $30,000,000 less than the House allocation and administration's request. Amtrak requested a total of $365,000,000 in capital, an increase of $135,000,000 above fiscal year 1995. The railroad contends that steep reductions in its operating request are not feasible without significantly higher capital funding.

It is difficult to quantify the effects of terminating Amtrak on transportation, energy, and social issues. However, the complete deletion of Federal support likely would precipitate the liquidation of Amtrak, and cost millions of dollars. Net Federal, State, and local government outlays could even increase in the short run because of lower income, payroll, and other tax revenues; costs that would appear elsewhere in outlays; and labor protection obligations.

Amtrak's future.—The House has conditioned Amtrak's appropriation upon the enactment of authorizing legislation containing significant reforms, including labor reforms.

While the Senate Appropriations Committee has not fenced in Amtrak's funding pending action by the authorizing committees, Amtrak's long-term viability and continued contribution to our national transportation system clearly depend on legislative and managerial reforms. Amtrak officials testified that, in order to continue to operate in a stronger, more businesslike manner, Amtrak needs relief from many externally imposed costs that are not directly related to train operations and for which its primary competitors are not responsible. For example, Amtrak argues for: freedom to collectively bargain labor/management issues; more favorable apportionment of Northeast corridor costs; a dedicated funding source; freedom to bargain with States to achieve fuller reimbursement for the costs of routes and services; elimination from Amtrak's operating budget of the mandatory payment requirement for excess railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance; freedom to issue tax-exempt debt; tort reform; and other items.

The Committee believes that there are strong arguments in favor of continuing Federal support for intercity passenger rail service. It is crucial, however, that congressional authorizing committees

expeditiously provide the policy and legal framework needed for such public service to be successfully provided. This Committee must refer to current laws when allocating transportation dollars, and cannot assume that legislative reforms will be approved. Thus, within its tight budget allocation, the Committee has sought to provide a sufficient sum of grant funds for Amtrak.

State infrastructure banks.—Provisions included in this bill create a program of State infrastructure banks which will greatly enhance financing options for transportation projects across the modes: aviation, highways, rail freight, transit, ports, et cetera. There is a glaring exclusion from this program—Amtrak. Amtrak is excluded because the administration would have required an untenable amount of the Committee's budget allocation to cover the risk of Amtrak's participation: OMB would account for a loan to Amtrak in the same way as a grant. The Committee's efforts to expand the use of its limited Amtrak funds have been diminished because it cannot offer Amtrak Federal loan guaranties. The Committee is hugely frustrated with the administration's treatment of Amtrak which has resulted in the Committee being unable to enhance Amtrak's access to tools of modern financial management, and less Federal assistance for the railroad.

The Committee had sought to augment Amtrak's grant with loan guaranties. Working with the railroad and the Federal Railroad Administration, the Committee believed that it made sense to provide Amtrak with an opportunity to secure low-interest federally guaranteed loans to purchase new locomotives, or other assets, that clearly would help produce more revenues. Paying back a loan on time is what most companies do to demonstrate their credit worthiness. Repayment of such loans by Amtrak would have further demonstrated the success of restructuring reforms.

The administration's budget called for Amtrak to be included in the Federal portion of the proposed Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP] with the States portion—the unified grant—to grow over time. This plan envisioned the State role regarding Amtrak funding to increase. Presumably, States would have had access to SIB's to assist Amtrak. This makes the administration's position on federally guaranteed loans for Amtrak even more difficult to accept. No legislation with respect to UTIIP has passed either the Senate or the House.

Flexible funding for Amtrak.—The Committee also points out that under the Senate-passed National Highway System Designation Act, Senate bill 440, States would have the authority to allocate flexible Federal transportation funds for intercity rail passenger service. Billions of dollars per year from the congestion mitigation and air quality program and the surface transportation program would be newly accessible for Amtrak projects, if State officials so choose. This flexible and intermodal approach to transportation funding, if enacted by Congress, would provide a welcome assist to Amtrak's financial program.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1996 PROGRAM

The Federal Transit Administration was established as a component of the Department of Transportation by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, effective July 1, 1968, which transferred most of the functions and programs under the Federal Transit Act of 1964, as amended (78 Stat. 302; 49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The missions of the Federal Transit Administration are: to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods; to encourage the planning and establishment of urban mass transportation services needed for economical and desirable urban development; to provide mobility for transit dependents; to maximize productivity of urban transportation systems; and to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such services and systems.

Funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority is authorized under Public Law 101–551. The Stark-Harris authorizations have all been expended.

In fiscal year 1996, the administration proposed to fund all but the violent crime reduction programs through a proposed Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP]. Neither the House nor Senate authorizing committees has moved the necessary legislation for this proposed consolidation.

Under the Committee recommendation, a total program level of $4,093,850,000 would be provided for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration for fiscal year 1996. This is $851,371,000 less than the budget request and $101,340,000 above the House allocation.

The following table summarizes the Committee's recommendations compared to fiscal year 1995, the administration's request, and the House allowance:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Fiscal year 1995 enacted [1]	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Administrative expenses	42,595	[2] (44,202)	39,260	42,000
Formula grants [3]	2,499,911	2,865,050	2,000,000	2,105,850
Discretionary grants [3]	1,724,904	1,724,944	1,665,000	1,665,000
Transit planning and research	92,079	[2] (100,027)	82,250	90,000
University transportation centers	6,000	[2] (6,000)	6,000	6,000
Interstate transfer grants—transit	48,030	.....	.....	.....
Washington Metro	200,000	[2] (200,000)	200,000	170,000
Violent crime reduction programs	.....	5,000	.....	.....
Total	4,613,519	4,945,223	3,992,510	4,078,850

[1] Includes reductions pursuant to sections 323, 330, and 331 of Public Law 103–331 and amounts transferred to OST, salaries and expenses for civil rights activities.

[2] Funding included under UTIIP.

[3] Includes obligation limitation on contract authority in 1995 and 1996.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$42,594,700
Budget estimate, 1996	44,202,000
House allowance	39,260,000
Committee recommendation	42,000,000

The administration proposes to fund transit administrative expenses through the Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program. The Committee recommends a total of $42,000,000 in general funds for administrative expenses. The amount provided is $2,740,000 more than the House allowance and $2,202,000 less than the administration's request.

FORMULA GRANTS

	General	Trust	Total
Appropriations, 1995	$1,349,911,000	$1,150,000,000	$2,499,911,000
Budget estimate, 1996	1,744,200,000	1,120,850,000	2,865,050,000
House allowance	890,000,000	1,100,000,000	2,000,000,000
Committee recommendation	985,000,000	1,120,850,000	2,105,850,000

The Formula Grant Program has funded sections 5307, 5310(a)2, 5311, and 5336, providing grants on the basis of a formula to State and local agencies for mass transportation operating and capital expenses.

The Committee recommends $2,105,850,000 for continuation of the Formula Grant Program including $111,328,000 for the section 18 Nonurban Formula Program; $52,379,000 for the section 16(b) Elderly and Disabled Program, and $1,532,432,643 for the section 9, Capital Grants Program.

Urbanized areas with populations of 200,000 or more.—These areas would receive $1,448,408,297 (not including the one-half percent set-aside). The amount for each area is derived based on the bus and rail operating statistics and population factors for each area. The bus tier, which contains about 67 percent of the total funds allocates most of these funds 50 percent based on revenue vehicle miles, 25 percent based on population, and 25 percent based on population density. In the rail tier, the remaining 33 percent, most of the funds are allocated 60 percent based on revenue vehicle miles and 40 percent based on route miles. Within the bus and rail tiers there is also an incentive portion, or tier, which is based on passenger miles and operating costs.

Urbanized areas under 200,000 population.—These areas would receive $84,024,346 (not including the one-half percent set-aside) to be distributed 50 percent based on population and 50 percent based on population density.

Nonurbanized areas.—These areas would receive $111,328,000. These funds are distributed based on nonurbanized area population not including the one-half percent setaside.

Elderly and disabled.—The section 16(b)(2) program would receive $52,379,000.

Operating assistance.—The Committee has included bill language limiting operating subsidies to $400,000,000. This is the same as

the House allowance and $100,000,000 less than the administration's request.

Distribution of operating assistance among urbanized areas [UZA's].—The Committee has included language in the bill to hold cuts in operating assistance for those urbanized areas [UZA's] under 200,000 in population to 20 percent below fiscal year 1995 levels, in recognition of the fact that transit operators in such areas generally depend on Federal operating assistance to meet a greater percentage of their operating budgets than operators in larger UZA's. The Committee recognizes, however, that transit operators in larger UZA's also rely on Federal operating assistance to meet a significant amount of annual operating expenses. It notes that all transit operators are struggling with increased operating costs associated with meeting Federal requirements under the Clean Air Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Federal drug and alcohol testing mandates. It also is aware that Federal operating aid was reduced by 12 percent in fiscal year 1995 and that further reductions may result in some combination of fare increase, service cuts, or increase support at the State and local government levels.

In order to offset the additional loss of operating aid for larger UZA's that will result from the provision described above, the Committee has also included language based on, but not identical to, proposals made by the American Public Transit Association [APTA], which would trade in operating authority for additional capital funding. The Committee's proposal would, in essence, provide a benefit similar that recommended by APTA for those transit operators in UZA's of more than 200,000 who are giving up operating assistance for the benefit of transit operators in smaller UZA's.

Paratransit requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA].—The Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] requires, that transit operators offer paratransit service, as well as accessible fixed route service, to persons with disabilities. The requirement to provide paratransit services to those passengers unable to use fixed-route transit service becomes effective January 26, 1996.

The Committee notes that many of the individuals who are eligible for ADA required paratransit service have in the past used Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] transportation services. Many of these individuals have, for one reason or another, seen a reduction in such HHS transportation service and now have to rely on financially strained transit operators for such service. The HHS agencies that provided transportation services already have expertise in providing paratransit service and it is estimated that in excess of $1,000,000,000 annually is being spent on HHS transportation services.

The Committee believes that, in order to most effectively implement the paratransit requirements of the ADA, the Department of Transportation should closely coordinate its efforts with those of the Department of Health and Human Services, and efforts should be made to determine if it might be more appropriate for HHS funded agencies to provide such paratransit services, and in cases where paratransit service formerly provided by HHS agencies is being provided by transit operators, whether HHS transportation funding might be used to help support the cost of such paratransit service. The Committee directs the Secretary of Transportation,

working with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to prepare a report, detailing a strategic plan involving DOT coordination with HHS to provide paratransit services to individuals with disabilities who are unable to use fixed-route transit service. This report shall be provided to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees by December 1, 1995.

UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION CENTERS

Appropriations, 1995	$6,000,000
Budget estimate, 1996	6,000,000
House allowance	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	6,000,000

Section 5317(b) of title 49 U.S.C. provides for the university transportation centers program. The purpose of the university transportation centers program is to become a national resource and focal point for the support and conduct of research and training concerning the transportation of passengers and property.

TRANSIT PLANNING AND RESEARCH

Appropriations, 1995	$92,079,000
Budget estimate, 1996	100,027,000
House allowance	82,250,000
Committee recommendation	90,000,000

The Committee has recommended $90,000,000 for transit planning and research. This is $7,750,000 more than the House allocation and $10,027,000 less than the administration's request. The Committee, unlike the House, has not altered the statutory distribution of this account into its subparts. Funds for this program can draw up to 3 percent of the total FTA funding level excluding WMATA. The separate programs combined are: the research, training, and human resources program (sections 6, 10, 11, and 20), the planning program (section 8), and the rural transit assistance program (section 18(h)). Under the national component of the program, the Federal Transit Administration is a catalyst in the research, development, and deployment of transportation methods and technologies addressing such issues as accessibility for the disabled, air quality, and traffic congestion. Funds for the State and local component of the program will ensure that all localities have sufficient funds to improve the State and local planning process and to participate in research efforts with regional applications.

Transit planning and research funds are allocated by formula as authorized in 49 U.S.C. section 5314. The House reduced funding for all research accounts 5 percent below the administration's request, except for the national program, which is reduced by 17.6 percent. The Committee does not agree with this allocation, and has distributed funds among the transit planning and research accounts as specified in the program's authorization.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendation:

	Fiscal year 1995 program level	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Metropolitan planning	$41,512,000	$41,512,000	$39,436,250	$40,500,000
Rural transit assistance program	4,613,000	4,613,000	4,381,250	4,500,000

	Fiscal year 1995 program level	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
State planning and research program	8,475,000	8,475,000	8,051,250	8,250,000
Transit cooperative research program	8,475,000	8,475,000	8,051,250	8,250,000
National Transit Institute	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,850,000	3,000,000
National planning and research program	34,004,000	33,952,000	19,480,000	25,500,000
Total	100,079,000	100,027,000	82,250,000	90,000,000

National program.—The Committee does concur with the House report language deleting funding for a number of low-priority, nonessential programs, including the transit ambassadors program, step-by-step diversity training for FTA grantees, outreach activities, grants to universities and colleges to create transportation courses, the environmental justice program, transit educational materials for children, the Coming and Going Education Program, and livable communities initiatives. Within the national program, the following funds are provided for important, ongoing initiatives:

Project ACTION (accessible community transportation in our Nation)	$2,000,000
Advanced technology transit bus	8,000,000
Fuel cell bus technology	6,000,000
Research on large circuit breakers and switch gears	3,250,000
Intermodal positioning system (inertial navigation technology)	1,000,000
ALABC	1,000,000

Large circuit breakers and switchgear.—The Committee concurs with the recommendation of the House and directs the FTA to continue to provide funding for research and development of large circuit breakers and switchgear. The Committee, however, has provided $3,250,000 for this purpose. The Committee, therefore, directs that funding continue to be made available to a team consisting of SEPTA and a domestic manufacturer of large military circuit breakers and switchgear.

Advanced Transportation Systems Program.—The Committee directs the FTA to continue the Advanced Transportation Systems and Electric Vehicle Technology Program established under section 6071 of title VI of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act [ISTEA]. The Committee is aware of the contributions to lead acid battery research and advanced alternative fuel transit development that participating advanced transportation technology consortia have made to the Advanced Transportation Systems Program.

Within this program, the Committee directs the FTA to allocate $1,000,000 of the funds made available for the Advanced Transportation Systems and Electric Vehicle Technology Program to the Advanced Lead-Acid Battery Consortium [ALABC]. This is the second and final phase of funding for the consortium and will enable the ALABC to place prototype, advanced valve-regulated lead-acid batteries in electric bus facilities for inservice testing and demonstration.

Fuel Cell Transit Bus Program.—The Committee directs the FTA to provide $6,000,000 to continue the Fuel Cell Transit Bus Program and allow completion of the phase III test program. Funds should also be provided for continuation of the commercialization process for the 40-foot fuel cell bus. The Committee urges the FTA

to work cooperatively with all parties involved in this project, to ensure an appropriate and consistent level of funding for commercialization of the 40-foot bus.

Inertial navigation technology for transit vehicles.—The Committee provides $1,000,000 to continue the research authorized to be conducted by the traffic safety research alliance on the deployment of an inertial navigation system in urban and rural areas.

Project ACTION.—The Committee provides $2,000,000 to continue Project ACTION (accessible community transportation in our Nation), which is administered by the National Easter Seal Society through a cooperative agreement with the FTA.

Monobeam system.—Recognizing the potential for U.S. industry development, the Committee urges the Department to support development of a full-scale prototype of a monobeam transit system within available funds. Full-scale demonstration with substantial private-sector participation will significantly advance this environmentally sensitive, low-capital cost technology toward production.

House directives.—The Committee does not concur with the House Committee directives regarding earmarks for Team Transit Program of the Minnesota Metropolitan Commission; Dulles corridor studies; or the Hennepin County MN, community works program.

TRUST FUND SHARE OF TRANSIT PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	($1,150,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(1,120,850,000)
House allowance	(1,120,850,000)
Committee recommendation	(1,120,850,000)

Under ISTEA, Public Law 102–240, four transit accounts can be funded from the mass transit account of the highway trust fund, the general fund, or a mix of the two. In 1996, as in 1995, the Federal Transit Administration and the Committee propose funding only formula grants with both trust and general funds. Administrative expenses, university transportation centers, and planning and research will be funded only with general funding in order to simplify a complex accounting procedure.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	($1,724,904,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(1,724,944,000)
House allowance	(1,665,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(1,665,000,000)

Section 5338(b) of 49 U.S.C. authorizes discretionary grants or loans to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof to be used in financing mass transportation investments. Under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, Public Law 102–240, investments may include construction of new fixed

guideway systems; extensions to existing guideway systems; major bus fleet expansions; and rail modernization expenditures for existing older rail systems. Planning is funded, along with research, within the new transit planning and research appropriation.

The Committee recommends a level of $1,665,000,000. This is the same as that recommended by the House and $59,944,000 less than the administration's request. It is the full amount authorized from the trust fund by Public Law 102–240.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1995 program level	Fiscal year 1996 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendations
Bus and bus facilities	353,310	274,992	333,000	333,000
Existing rail modernization	724,960	724,976	666,000	666,000
New systems and new extensions	646,634	724,976	666,000	666,000
Total	1,724,904	[1] 1,724,944	1,665,000	1,665,000

[1] Includes $59,944,000 in general funds.

Three-year availability of section 3 discretionary funds.—The Committee has redistributed unallocated discretionary bus and new starts funds from projects which were funded in the fiscal year 1993 transportation appropriations bill (Public Law 102–388), making these funds available for reallocation in fiscal year 1996. In section 374 of Public Law 102–388, funding availability for these discretionary funds is limited to 3 years from enactment. A total of $22,840,000 has been reprogrammed to the new systems account, increasing the available funding from $666,000,000 to $688,840,000.

Interstate compact infrastructure banks.—Provisions in this bill create a program of State infrastructure banks which will greatly enhance capital financing options for transit projects across the Nation. These innovative financing tools, including loans, will be available to transit new starts as well as other transit capital projects.

BUS AND BUS FACILITIES

In allocating funds under discretionary grants for buses and bus facilities, the Committee has deleted funding for many meritorious projects which were included in the House version of the bill. The Committee has deleted funding for these projects without prejudice. Budget constraints have required the Committee to use limited funds to identify projects that have not already been recognized in the House version of the bill. However, the Committee expects to give full consideration to all projects in the House and Senate bills during conference committee deliberations on the Fiscal Year 1995 Transportation Appropriations Act.

The recommended amount includes the following allocations:

BUSES AND BUS FACILITIES

State/city/county	Description	Committee recommendation
Arkansas:		
Little Rock	Central Arkansas transit transfer facility	$1,000,000
Fayetteville (University of Arkansas)	Intermodal transfer facility	5,400,000
California:		
Long Beach	Bus replacement and parts	3,000,000
Los Angeles	Gateway Intermodal Transit Center	15,000,000
San Diego	San Ysidro Intermodal Center	10,000,000
San Francisco	BART ADA compliance/paratransit	4,460,000
San Joaquin	RTD bus replacement	10,560,000
Florida: Miami (Metro-Dade)	Buses for Metro-Dade Transit	16,000,000
Hawaii: Honolulu, Oahu	Kuakini Medical Center parking facility	8,000,000
Illinois: Chicago	Replacement buses/communication system	13,700,000
Iowa:		
Cedar Rapids	Hybrid electric bus consortium	2,960,000
State of Iowa	Buses, equipment, and facilities	8,000,000
Waterloo	Intermodal bus facility	1,340,000
Ottumwa	Global positioning system equipment	700,000
Maryland: State of Maryland	MTA replacement buses	16,000,000
Michigan:		
Lansing	Intermodal Transportation Center	4,180,000
State of Michigan	ISTEA set-aside requirement	10,000,000
Missouri:		
Kansas City	Union Station intermodal	13,000,000
St. Louis	MetroLink bus purchase	10,000,000
State of Missouri	Buses and bus facilities	11,000,000
Nevada: Clark County	Buses and bus facility	20,000,000
New Jersey:		
Garden State Parkway	Park-n-ride at Interchange 165	2,300,000
Hamilton Township	Intermodal facility/bus maintenance	25,000,000
New York:		
Albany	Buses	10,000,000
Long Island	Buses	3,000,000
New York City	Natural gas buses/fueling station	10,000,000
Rensselaer	Intermodal station	7,500,000
Rochester-Genessee	Buses	1,400,000
Utica (and rural counties)	Buses	6,000,000
Ohio: Columbus	Bus transfer center	10,000,000
Oregon:		
Wilsonville	Transit vehicles	500,000
Eugene lane transit district [LTD]	Radio system	1,300,000
Pennsylvania:		
Beaver County	Bus facility	3,300,000
Erie	Intermodal complex	8,000,000
Philadelphia	Chestnut Street/alternative fuel vehicles	2,000,000
Pittsburgh	Busway system	10,000,000
Texas:		
Corpus Christi	ADART dispatching system	1,600,000
Robstown/Corpus Christi	Bus shelters/curb cuts/transit center	800,000
Vermont:		
State of Vermont	Buses and bus facilities	6,000,000
Marble Valley	Bus upgrades	2,000,000
Virginia: Richmond	Downtown multimodal station	10,000,000
Washington:		
Everett	Everett multimodal center	7,000,000
Seattle	Seattle Metro/King County multimodal	4,000,000
Seattle/King County	Seattle Metro bus purchase	10,000,000

BUSES AND BUS FACILITIES—Continued

State/city/county	Description	Committee recommendation
Tacoma	Tacoma dome arena multimodal	5,000,000
Wenatchee	Chelan-Douglas multimodal	2,000,000
Total		333,000,000

The bill includes $333,000,000 under this heading for the purchase of buses, bus related equipment and paratransit vehicles and for the construction of bus-related facilities. These funds will assist in the replacement of many over-age buses in cities of all sizes, permit the expansion of bus service to accommodate community transit needs, help finance appropriate bus maintenance facility modernization or construction, assist in bus rehabilitation, and assist in the purchase of support equipment. In addition, these funds will be to defray costs to grantees associated with implementing requirements associated with the Americans With Disabilities Act and the Clean Air Act.

FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION

The Committee recommends a total of $666,000,000 for the modernization of existing rail transit systems. Under ISTEA all of the funds are distributed by formula. The following table itemizes by city the fiscal year 1996 rail modernization allocations:

Areas	*Fiscal year 1996 apportionment*
New York	$228,317,868
Southwestern Connecticut	30,238,186
Northeastern New Jersey	59,852,995
Chicago/Northwestern Indiana	94,083,037
Philadelphia/Southern New Jersey	68,353,400
Boston	46,966,395
San Francisco	43,346,200
Pittsburgh	14,619,242
Cleveland	10,234,467
Baltimore	11,252,003
New Orleans	1,977,169
Los Angeles	5,163,433
Washington, DC	14,498,674
Seattle	4,716,616
Atlanta	5,363,201
San Diego	1,865,716
San Jose	3,367,284
Providence	886,831
Dayton	1,415,918
Tacoma	170,335
Wilmington	278,710
Trenton	493,550
Lawrence-Haverhill	432,833
Chattanooga	17,404
Baltimore	2,077,988
Minneapolis	970,638
St. Louis	134,739
Denver	323,695
Norfolk	341,533
Kansas City	18,106
Honolulu	221,697
Hartford	376,909
Madison	176,241

Areas	*Fiscal year 1996 apportionment*
San Juan	891,176
Detroit	165,760
Dallas	266,485
Sacramento	841,768
Houston	1,413,969
Buffalo	378,659
Portland	743,813
Miami	2,752,667
Phoenix	997,690
Total	661,005,000
Three-fourths of 1 percent takedown	4,995,000
Total appropriation	666,000,000

NEW SYSTEMS

The bill includes $666,000,000, the fully authorized level, and $22,840,000 of reprogrammed funds, for a total of $688,840,000. These funds are available for preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, project management, oversight, and construction for new systems and extensions. According to specific project needs, these funds shall also be available for preliminary stages of projects named for funding. The funds are to be distributed as follows:

Atlanta-MARTA North Springs extension	$42,410,000
Boston-South Boston Piers Transitway, MOS–2	22,620,000
Burlington-Charlotte, Vermont commuter rail	11,300,000
Chicago central area circulator	5,000,000
Dallas-DART:	
South Oak Cliff LRT	16,941,000
North central extension	3,500,000
Dallas-Fort Worth RAILTRAN	7,000,000
Florida Tri-County commuter rail	10,000,000
Houston-METRO regional bus plan	22,630,000
Los Angeles Metro Rail MOS–3	45,000,000
Maryland commuter rail [MARC]	15,000,000
Maryland—Baltimore central corridor LRT	22,630,000
Miami Metrorail North 27th Avenue extension	2,000,000
New Jersey urban core	85,500,000
New York Queens connector	160,000,000
Pittsburgh Airport busway projects	22,630,000
Portland Westside LRT	130,140,000
Salt Lake City light rail project	14,519,000
San Francisco BART Airport/Tasman extensions	22,620,000
St. Louis Metrolink	13,000,000
Wisconsin Central commuter [Metra]	14,400,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

Atlanta-MARTA North Line extension.—The Committee recommends $42,410,000 for the Atlanta-MARTA North Line extension project. This 9-mile, five-station extension will allow Atlanta's heavy rail rapid transit system to serve the rapidly growing area north of Atlanta, and will connect this area with the rest of the region by providing better transit service for both commuters and inner-city residents. The extension to Dunwoody is presently under construction; the extension to North Springs is in final design. The local share commitment for the federally funded portion of this extension is 21 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $5 per new passenger trip. FTA has determined that the grantee has the finan-

cial capacity to build and operate this project. An FFGA for the Dunwoody to North Springs segment was issued in December 1994 which fulfilled the requirements of section 3035(tt) of ISTEA. All of the $29,460,000 in funds provided to this segment since the enactment of ISTEA have been obligated, as has the $10,000,000 provided in pre-ISTEA funds. No funds were appropriated for this project in the fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995 appropriations. The FFGA funding schedule provides for $42,410,000 in fiscal year 1996 new starts funds, with the remaining $223,140,000 provided over fiscal year 1997–2000. To date, $132,000,000 has been obligated to the project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. The 3.1-mile federally funded segment of the North Line extension (Medical Center to North Springs) received an ISTEA earmark of $329,000,000.

Boston-South Boston Piers Transitway MOS–2.—The Committee recommends $22,620,000 for the South Boston Piers Transitway project. This project consists of a 1-mile bus tunnel connecting South Station to the World Trade Center and Fan Pier. The tunnel will be used by electric trolleybuses, its construction is timed to link the central artery/tunnel highway project now underway. The project is in the final design stage. The local share commitment to this project is 20 percent. The cost-effectiveness index ranges from $9 to $16 per new passenger trip. FTA has determined that the grantee has the financial capacity to build and operate this project. An FFGA was issued in November 1994 in the amount of $330,730,000; this includes the $92,460,000 provided in fiscal year 1995 and prior years. The FFGA funding schedule provides for $22,620,000 in fiscal year 1996. The remaining $215,650,000 would be provided over the course of fiscal years 1997–2000. To date, $92,500,000 has been obligated to the project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. This project received an ISTEA earmark of $278,000,000.

Burlington-Charlotte, VT, commuter rail.—The Committee recommends $11,300,000 to complete the Federal share of capital improvements for the Burlington-Charlotte commuter rail project. These funds will be used for the purchase of rail cars and improvements to existing tracks currently used by Amtrak and Vermont Railway to provide commuter rail service between the cities of Burlington and Charlotte. The State of Vermont is willing to utilize flex funding [STP] for this project, with an initial grant of $750,000 projected for approval in the first quarter of fiscal year 1996, after all issues, including environmental questions, have been addressed. The balance of funding (also from flex funds) would be provided in outyears. The State of Vermont has also committed to financing all required operating costs associated with this commuter rail project. The Vermont Agency on Transportation estimates the cost of the commuter rail alternative to be $7,700,000. The project is in the planning stage with a major investment study [MIS] nearing completion. A public hearing on the preferred alternative will be held after the study is completed. The MIS identifies a preliminary cost-effectiveness index of $7 per new passenger trip. Discretionary funds have not yet been authorized or appropriated for this corridor.

Canton-Akron-Cleveland commuter rail.—The Committee recommends no funding for the northeast Ohio corridor project. The House provided $6,500,000 for this project. The Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency [NOACA] has initiated work on a feasibility study to select potential commuter rail corridors for serving urban and suburban areas in northeastern Ohio. This phase is scheduled to be completed in mid-1996. A follow-on phase will assess economic ad environmental implications of a commuter rail system as well as analyze other transportation modes available to meet anticipated travel demand. This project was earmarked in ISTEA for $1,600,000,000. Through fiscal year 1995, $1,790,000,000 has been appropriated to this project and $990,000 has been obligated.

Chicago central area circulator.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for the Chicago central area circulator project. The House provided no funding for this project. This project had completed the preliminary engineering stage, and was poised to seek $42,410,000 for final design (the amount requested by the administration for fiscal year 1996). The project was to be funded in shares of one-third by its Federal, State, and local participants. The Illinois Legislature has now deleted its cost-share of the circulator, and the project sponsors are in process of reducing the project's scope and increasing the Federal share (not to exceed 50 percent). Delays can be expected as the project plan is reconsidered, its financing commitments redone, and the new phased-in project enters the required environmental review stage. The project's full funding grant agreement [FFGA] provides a total of $258,370,000 including $116,230,000 provided through fiscal year 1995. This FFGA must be renegotiated with the Federal Transit Administration to reflect the phased-in project when the details of the rescoped project are settled. The Committee has provided a small amount of funding to enable this project to move forward in fiscal year 1996.

Cincinnati Northeast/northern Kentucky rail.—The Committee recommends no funding for the Cincinnati Northeast/northern Kentucky corridor. The House provided $2,000,000 for this project. The administration did not request any funding. This corridor extends from the Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport through downtown Cincinnati to Paramount's Kings Island Amusement Park in Warren County, OH. This 33-mile corridor paralleling I–71 generally runs in a northeasterly direction, and so is referred to as the Northeast corridor. The Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments [OKI] is conducting a planning study of transportation alternatives in this corridor. The study is expected to be completed in 1997. Pending completion of the study, there is no information on the nature of the project, its costs and benefits, and the local share commitment to the project; therefore, additional funding is not yet required. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $2,530,000. To date, $2,530,000 has been obligated with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. This project is not authorized in ISTEA.

Dallas-DART South Oak Cliff Line.—The Committee recommends $16,941,000 for the Dallas-DART South Oak Cliff Line. This amount is the same as that provided by the House and will complete this project. This line is part of a 20-mile, $835,000,000

light rail starter system which is being constructed by Dallas Area Rapid Transit [DART]. The 9.6-mile, 13 station South Oak Cliff Line extends from downtown Dallas to Ledbetter Drive in the South Oak Cliff area of Dallas. The project is under construction. The local share commitment to this project is 43 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $9 per new passenger trip. FTA has determined that the grantee has the financial capacity to build and operate this project. An FFGA in the amount of $160,000,000 has been issued for this project, fulfilling the requirements of section 3035(i) of ISTEA. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated a total of $143,100,000. To date, $143,100,000 has been obligated to the project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. The FFGA funding schedule calls for $16,940,000 in new starts funding in fiscal year 1996.

Dallas-DART north central light rail extension.—The Committee recommends $3,500,000 for the Dallas-DART north central light rail extension project. The House provided $2,500,000 for this project. This project is a 12.3-mile, six-station, $268,000,000 LRT extension to Plano. The northern portion of the line would be single track initially and an additional special events station would be provided in Plano. DART has completed a major investment study [MIS] and the preferred alternative was selected in September 1994. The project has been approved for preliminary engineering. The local share commitment to this project is 50 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $11 per new passenger trip. FTA has assigned a financial rating of low/medium to this project. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $2,500,000 for this project. To date, no funds have been obligated with the $2,500,000 appropriation remaining unobligated. The project is not authorized in ISTEA.

Dallas-Fort Worth RAILTRAN.—The Committee recommends $7,000,000 for the Dallas-Fort Worth RAILTRAN project. The House provided $5,000,000 for this project. This project, scheduled to open in 1998, consists of commuter rail service over 25 miles of track from South Irving to Fort Worth. The project includes service to the Fort Worth Intermodal Transportation Center. The project is in the preliminary engineering stage. The cost-effectiveness index is $8 per new passenger trip. FTA has assigned a financial rating of medium/low to the project. The capital costs of phases one and two are $68,200,000 and $101,000,000 respectively. Phase one of the project is fully funded with local (60 percent), section 5307 (25 percent) and CMAQ funds (15 percent), and no section 5309 funds. The capital funding plan for phase two assumes funding from section 5309 (44 percent), CMAQ funds (20 percent), highway demonstration funds (13 percent), and local funds (23 percent). Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $5,460,000 for this project. To date, $2,480,000 has been obligated with $2,980,000 of prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. The project received an ISTEA earmark of $5,680,000.

Dulles corridor rail project.—The Committee recommends no funding for the Dulles corridor study. The House also did not provide funding for the project. A major investment study [MIS] is expected to be completed in 1996 that will generate information on the mobility improvements, cost effectiveness, environmental bene-

fits, and operating efficiencies associated with rail and bus alternatives. The corridor links west Falls Church, VA, and Washington Dulles International Airport. The estimated cost of the rail alternatives are $1,000,000,000 or more. Pending completion of the study, there is no information on the cost-effectiveness index and local financial plan. Section 3035(aaa) of ISTEA directs FTA to negotiate and sign a multiyear grant agreement in the amount of $6,000,000 with the Commonwealth of Virginia for the completion of the MIS and preliminary engineering. No money has been appropriated to date.

Florida (Miami) Tri-County commuter rail.—The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for the Tri-County commuter rail project, the same as the House allowance. The Tri-County Commuter Rail Authority (Tri-Rail) operates a 67-mile commuter rail system connecting Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties. Tri-Rail's short-range program includes the addition of a second track and rehabilitation of the signal system. These improvements will reduce conflicts with Amtrak and CSX freight trains. The project is in the final design stage. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress appropriated $24,500,000 in section 5309 new starts funds for Tri-Rail improvements. To date, $24,500,000 has been obligated to the project, with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. Information concerning the total cost of the program, local share commitment, cost-effectiveness index, and financial plan is not available. The project was not authorized in ISTEA.

Houston-METRO regional bus plan.—The Committee recommends $22,630,000 for the Houston-METRO regional bus plan. This $625,000,000 plan, developed by Houston METRO, consists of a package of major improvements to its existing bus system. It includes major service expansions in most of the region, new and extended HOV (high-occupancy vehicle) facilities and ramps, several transit centers and park-and-ride lots, and supporting facilities. The individual elements of the plan are in various stages of development, from preliminary engineering to construction. The local share commitment to this project is 20 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $3 per new passenger trip. FTA has determined that the grantee has the financial capacity to build and operate this project. An FFGA was issued for this project on December 30, 1994, which fulfilled the requirements of section 3035(uu) of ISTEA. A total of $29,780,000 was provided to this project in the fiscal year 1995 budget. An additional $88,200,000 in ISTEA funds was earmarked in fiscal year 1994 and prior years, and $146,070,000 was provided in pre-ISTEA budgets; all of these funds have been obligated. The FFGA funding schedule for this project provides for $22,630,000 in fiscal year 1996 new starts funds, with the remaining $212,730,000 needed to complete the project provided in fiscal years 1997–2000. To date, $264,660,000 has been obligated to the project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. The project received an ISTEA earmark of $500,000,000.

Jacksonville automated skyway express.—The Committee recommends no funding for the Jacksonville, FL, automated skyway express [ASE]. This 0.7-mile extension south of downtown Jacksonville consists of an elevated, double track guideway running from the San Marcos Station, now under construction, through the

South Bank business district to St. John's place. This final segment will enlarge the ASE system to 2.5 miles. The project is in the final design stage. The local share commitment to the project is 20 percent. FTA has assigned a financial rating of medium to this project. Information concerning the cost-effectiveness index is not available. The Jacksonville project received an ISTEA earmark of $71,200,000. An FFGA in the amount of $44,000,000 was issued in fiscal year 1991 and amended in fiscal year 1994. To date, $49,640,000 has been appropriated and obligated, completing the FFGA. The 9.7-mile south extension is not covered under the FFGA and estimated to cost $32,000,000.

In 1989, the skyway opened a 0.7-mile starter line that now averages 1,600 riders per day. The FTA's report pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 5309(m)(3) states that Jacksonville does not have an ongoing dedicated funding source to support its transit capital program and rates as low its capital financing commitment. Project sponsors estimate that by the year 2005, daily ridership will increase to 38,000 riders.

The Committee has not provided any additional funds for this project, while the House has earmarked $12,500,000 conditioned on the State's planned $25,000,000 contribution to the Fuller Warren Bridge project. Project sponsors have argued that since the State of Florida has agreed to provide funding for this bridge as well as for the I–4 Interchange, that this effort should justify providing $25,000,000 in Federal transit funds to complete the final 0.35 miles of the skyway. Evidently, the Jacksonville Transportation Authority is not permitted to spend transit funds derived from sales taxes on the skyway project. Regardless of this local problem, the Committee's decision on transit funding rests on the merits of individual transit projects under consideration. Given the overwhelming demands on this account, the Committee cannot provide funding this year.

Kansas City, MO, light rail.—The Committee recommends no funding for the Kansas City light rail project. The House also did not provide any funds for the project. The Kansas City Area Transportation Authority [KCATA] has completed a major investment study [MIS] in the Southtown corridor. The corridor extends from the riverfront and downtown Kansas City south to I–435. The locally preferred alternative [LPA] consists of a 15.1-mile light rail line connecting the downtown Rivermarket area with the Country Club Plaza south of the city. From the plaza, the light rail project splits into two branches; the east branch serving the Watkins Drive corridor to 75th Street; and the west branch serving the Country Club corridor to 85th Street. The cost-effectiveness index is $16 per new passenger trip. The local share commitment to this project is 20 percent. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $1,500,000 for the project. To date, $570,000 has been obligated with $930,000 in prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. This project received an ISTEA earmark of $5,900,000.

Los Angeles.—The Committee recommends $45,000,000 for the Federal share of the Metro Rail minimum operable segment 3 [MOS–3]. The House provided $125,000,000 for the project, while the administration requested $158,860,000. This is the third minimum operable segment [MOS] of the Metro Rail Red Line project

in Los Angeles. The first segment, MOS–1, opened for revenue service in January 1993. MOS–2 is currently under construction, and the FFGA has been fulfilled. In May 1993, an FFGA was issued to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority [LACMTA] for MOS–3. ISTEA defined MOS–3 to include three smaller segments: the north Hollywood segment presently under construction, and the MidCity and East Side extensions which are undergoing final design. Total costs for the MidCity, north Hollywood, and East Side phase 1 segments are estimated to be $1,400,000,000. The local share commitment to this project is 54 percent. ISTEA authorized $695,000,000, plus $535,000,000 in advanced construction authority. In fiscal year 1995 and prior years, $356,700,000 was appropriated for MOS–3. Funding in the amount of $158,860,000 is recommended in fiscal year 1996 under the FFGA funding schedule, with the remaining $900,890,000 to be provided over the course of fiscal years 1997–2002. Through fiscal year 1995, $356,700,000 has been obligated for MOS–3 with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated.

Last year, the FTA suspended funding for this project as a result of construction problems that led to portions of the subway tunnel sinking. After final action on the fiscal year 1995 appropriation for this project, the Committee was belatedly made aware of outstanding construction problems that led the FTA to temporarily suspend all funding for the project. FTA reinstated the project's funding upon receiving assurances that LACMTA would exercise proper stewardship of Federal funds. The Committee is very concerned that commitments made by the LACMTA to implement safety and quality assurance program staffing shifts from contractors to LACMTA employees have not been met. While steps were taken to place the rail construction program under the direct supervision of the LACMTA rather than have it remain vested within a subsidiary entity, the Committee is not confident that appropriate construction supervision is in place. The project has been beset with construction problems such as tunnel liners integrity, misalignments of tunnel, a 70-foot by 70-foot sinkhole in Hollywood Boulevard, improper use of wooden support wedges rather than more costly steel supports, investigations into awards of bids and insurance contracts, and other improper activities. These problems now have culminated in the removal of the prime contractor; replacement of the prime contractor will necessarily bring about delays as work is transferred over to new parties. Thus, the Committee believes that it is time for this project to get its safety program in order, and back it up with strong oversight. The Committee instructs the Federal Transit Administration to assure that the commitments in staffing that were to be made by February 1995 actually be made before these or any other Federal funds are obligated to the LACMTA red line project.

The Committee is confident that its fiscal year 1996 appropriation, coupled with State and local funding, shall be sufficient to enable this project to continue with better attention given to safety oversight and quality assurance. These steps will strengthen and improve this project, and protect the billions of Federal dollars already invested in the Los Angeles metro.

Maryland central corridor LRT.—The Committee recommends $22,630,000 for the central corridor LRT extensions. The House provided $3,000,000 for this project. The Mass Transportation Administration of Maryland has constructed, using State and local funds, a 22.5-mile light rail transit line along existing railroad right-of-way from Glen Burnie through Baltimore to Timonium. The Federal project consists of a 5-mile extension of the light rail system from Timonium to Hunt Valley, a 2-mile branch off the main line to Baltimore-Washington International Airport, and a 0.25-mile spur from the main line to Penn Station. The grantee has signed a design-build contract to complete the LRT extensions. The local share commitment to this project is 20 percent. However, if this investment is viewed in the context of the complete system, the overall local share commitment is 82 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $8 per new passenger trip. FTA has determined that the grantee has the financial capacity to build and operate this project. The total cost of the three extensions of the project is estimated to be $106,000,000. Section 3035(nn) of ISTEA directs FTA to sign a multiyear grant agreement with the MTA to provide not less than $60,000,000 in new starts funds. An FFGA in the amount of $84,900,000 has been signed for the three extensions. Through fiscal year 1995, $47,300,000 has been appropriated. The FFGA funding schedule for this project provides for $22,630,000 in fiscal year 1996 new starts funds, with the remaining $15,020,000 required to complete the Federal portion of this project provided in fiscal year 1997. To date, FTA has obligated $47,300,000 to the project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated.

Maryland commuter rail [MARC] extensions.—The Committee recommends $15,000,000 for the MARC extensions. The House provided $10,000,000 for this project. This system would provide service to Washington, DC, from both Waldorf and Frederick, MD. FTA has provided planning funds to the Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland for a planning study to evaluate transit alternatives in the Waldorf area, the study is expected to be completed in late 1995. The extension of MARC service to Frederick consists of a 13.5-mile line and will operate on existing CSX transportation rail right-of-way. The Frederick extension is in final design. The MARC program also includes new equipment and station improvements. The local share commitment to this project is 20 percent. FTA has determined that the grantee has the financial capacity to build and operate the Frederick project and the new equipment and station improvements. An FFGA was issued for the projects in June 1995 for $105,300,000, which includes $13,900,000 previously approved under the first increment of funding for the project. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $47,150,000 for this project. The FFGA funding schedule calls for $91,300,000 in new starts funding in fiscal years 1997–98. To date, $47,150,000 has been obligated to the project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. This project received an ISTEA earmark of $160,000,000.

Memphis Medical Center rail extension/Memphis regional rail plan.—The Committee recommends no funding for the Memphis Medical Center study. The House provided $2,500,000 for this project. The Memphis Area Transit Authority [MATA] currently op-

erates the 2.5-mile Main Street trolley, a vintage rail trolley line in downtown Memphis. MATA is studying alternatives, including a light rail line, connecting downtown and the medical center—the two largest employment centers in the Memphis area. The medical center extension is likely to be exempt from the section 3(i) criteria since the section 3 share would be less than $25,000,000. Information concerning project costs and benefits, the local share commitment, cost-effectiveness index, and financial plan is not yet available. MATA is also looking at another extension of the Main Street trolley via the Riverfront loop and examining an additional corridor to gauge potential for transit-oriented solutions. Congress appropriated $500,000 for the Memphis regional rail plan in fiscal year 1994. These funds were obligated this fiscal year (fiscal year 1995) and were applied to the above study activities.

Miami Metrorail North 27th Avenue.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Miami Metrorail North 27th Avenue corridor study. The House provided $2,000,000 for this project. The Metro-Dade Transit Agency [MDTA] is conducting a major investment study of transit alternatives in a 9.5-mile corridor centered on 27th Avenue. The corridor extends from northwest 62d Street on the south to the Dade/Broward County line on the north. The alternatives include an expansion of the Metrorail heavy rail system along various alignments, a busway, bus service improvements, and a no-build option. The potential for expanding the corridor into Broward County is also being considered in the study. The study is expected to be completed in September 1995. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $992,500 for this corridor. To date, $992,500 has been obligated with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. Pending completion of the study, information concerning the nature of the project, its costs and benefits, local share commitment, cost-effectiveness index, and financial plan is not available. The project was not mentioned in ISTEA.

New Jersey urban core.—The Committee recommends $85,500,000 for the New Jersey urban core project. The House provided $75,000,000 for this project. This project consists of a number of rail improvements designed to improve mobility in the region. The urban core project consists of the following segments: Secaucus transfer; Kearney connection, Hudson-Bergen line; Newark Airport-Elizabeth transit link; Northeast corridor signal system; a rail connection between Penn Station, Newark, and Broad Street Station, Newark; and improvements to New York Penn Station.

Section 3031(c) specifically exempts these projects from the project justification requirements of section 5309(e)(2)–(7) and from FTA's major capital investment policy. Section 3031 of ISTEA directs FTA to sign an FFGA for those elements of the New Jersey urban core program of projects which can be fully funded in fiscal years 1992–97. The local financial commitment is accounted for through the ISTEA toll revenue credit provision. ISTEA earmarked $634,400,000 for the entire urban core program of projects. An FFGA was issued for the Secaucus transfer project in December 1994 to provide a total of $444,300,000 through fiscal year 1998, including funds already provided in prior years.

The $448,000,000 Secaucus transfer station, a three-level transfer station allowing commuters on the main line, Bergen County line, Pascack Valley line, and Port Jervis line to transfer to Northeast corridor commuter trains destined to Penn Station in midtown Manhattan or Penn Station in Newark, is currently under construction. The Secaucus FFGA funding schedule calls for $85,540,000 in new starts funding in fiscal year 1996 with $125,500,000 scheduled in fiscal years 1997–98. The $530,000,000 Hudson-Bergen light rail project, a 15.3-mile, 24-station at-grade LRT line from the Vince Lombardi park-and-ride lot through Hoboken and Jersey City to Route 440 in southwest Jersey City, is in preliminary engineering. The cost-effectiveness index is $5 per new passenger trip.

The $640,000,000 Newark Elizabeth light rail project, an 8-mile, 12-station light rail transit line linking the cities of Newark and Elizabeth and Newark International Airport, is in preliminary engineering. The cost-effectiveness index is $11 per new passenger trip.

Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated a total of $356,000,000 to New Jersey urban core projects. To date, $233,180,000 has been obligated to the Secaucus transfer project with no prior-year earmarks remaining unobligated; $58,500,000 has been obligated to the Hudson-Bergen project with $50,500,000 in prior-year earmarks remaining unobligated; $1,800,000 has been obligated to the Penn Station, NY, project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated; and $11,900,000 has been obligated to the Newark-Elizabeth project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated.

In testimony before the Committee, the Federal Transit Administrator stated his willingness to enter into negotiations with the New Jersey Transit regarding a contingent commitment on the Hudson Waterfront portion of New Jersey's urban core. The Committee encourages FTA to begin those negotiations and to sign a contingent commitment at the earliest possible date. The Hudson Waterfront project is authorized to receive funding as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991. Once constructed the Hudson Waterfront project will carry some 100,000 passengers per day. This transit project is of critical importance to the economic vitality of one of the most densely populated States in the country.

New Orleans Canal Street corridor.—The Committee recommends no funding for the New Orleans Canal Street corridor project. The House provided $10,000,000 for this project. The Regional Transit Authority [RTA] has initiated a major investment study to evaluate transit alternatives on the 4.9-mile Canal Street corridor. The light rail alternatives would follow the current Canal Cemeteries bus route from the Mississippi River to City Park Avenue. An additional leg of the route would connect Canal Street with the Union Passenger Terminal and possibly a parking area for proposed riverboat casinos. Alternatives analysis was initiated in September 1992. RTA is in the process of completing the MIS/DEIS and selecting the locally preferred alternative. Since fiscal year 1994, Congress has appropriated $13,500,000 for this project. To date, $2,000,000 has been obligated with $11,500,000 in prior-year

appropriations remaining unobligated. This project received an ISTEA earmark of $4,800,000.

New York 63d Street/Queens connector.—The Committee recommends $160,000,000 for the Queens Boulevard/63d Street connection project. The House provided $114,989,000 for this project. This one-third mile tunnel would relieve overcrowding on the Queens Boulevard subway lines by diverting service to the 63d Street Tunnel from the 53d Street Tunnel bottleneck. The total cost of the project is estimated to be $645,000,000. The extension is currently under construction. The local share commitment to this project is 53 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $5 per hour of travel time savings. FTA has determined that the grantee has the financial capacity to build and operate this project. Section 3033 of ISTEA directs FTA to sign a multiyear grant agreement with the New York City Transit Authority in the amount of $306,100,000 for the elements that can be fully funded in fiscal years 1992–96. A FFGA has been issued for the Queens Boulevard project. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $145,900,000 for this project. To date, $145,900,000 has been obligated to the project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. The FFGA calls for $152,270,000 in new starts funding in fiscal year 1996, with an additional $20,000,000 needed in fiscal year 1998 to complete the Federal commitment. The Committee has added funds to the administration's requested amount to assist this project, which is actively under construction, in catching up on funding shortfalls from previous years' allocations.

Orange County, CA.—The Committee recommends no funding for the Orange County transitway project. The House provided $5,000,000 for this project. The $337,000,000 Transitway project consists of exclusive HOV connections between existing HOV lanes on I–405 and SR–55, transit/access drop ramps between the HOV lanes and adjacent activity centers, park and ride lots, and an expanded level of express bus service. The local share commitment to this project is 30 percent. The transitway is currently in preliminary engineering. The cost-effectiveness index is $4 per new passenger trip. FTA has rated the financial plan low. FTA issued a finding of no significant impact [FONSI] in July 1994 and a Letter of no prejudice [LONP] in September 1994 allowing OCTA to proceed to incur costs for design and right-of-way activities. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $20,300,000 for the project. To date, $20,300,000 in prior-year appropriations remain unobligated. The project was not authorized in ISTEA.

Pittsburgh Airport busway.—The Committee recommends $22,630,000 for the airport busway project, the same as the House allowance. The Port Authority (PATransit) is constructing a 20-mile busway in the airport corridor between downtown Pittsburgh and the Greater Pittsburgh International Airport. The project is estimated to cost $326,800,000. The busway project is presently under construction. The local share commitment to the project is 21 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $4 per new passenger trip. FTA has determined that the grantee has the financial capacity to build and operate this project. An FFGA was issued for this project in October 1994. The FFGA envisions $121,000,000 in section 5309 new start funds, $10,000,000 in section 5309 bus funds,

$76,500,000 in CMAQ funds, and $49,300,000 from highway funding sources. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $75,900,000 in new start funds for the project. To date, $75,900,000 has been obligated to the project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. The FFGA funding schedule calls for $22,630,000 in new starts funding in fiscal year 1996, and $22,500,000 in fiscal year 1997.

Portland Westside LRT project.—The Committee recommends $130,140,000 for the Portland Westside LRT project. The House provided $85,500,000 for this project. The Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon [Tri-Met] is building a $910,000,000 light rail transit extension from downtown Portland, west through Beaverton, to a terminus in downtown Hillsboro. The Federal Transit Administration views the Portland project as a good example of innovative land use initiatives that integrate transportation planning and land use. One initiative is the use of urban growth boundaries that prevent urban sprawl and encourage development along transportation corridors, especially high-capacity transit corridors. This serves to promote transit ridership and economic activity. Another initiative is the cap on downtown parking spaces that encourages transit use. In downtown Portland, the 18-mile extension will connect to the existing Banfield LRT line (MAX) that operates between Portland and Gresham. The project is under construction. The local share commitment to this project is 27 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $16 per new passenger trip. In September 1992, FTA and Tri-Met entered into a full funding grant agreement [FFGA] for the 12-mile segment from downtown Portland to 185th Avenue. The section 5309 new starts share for this segment is $516,000,000. The FFGA was amended in 1994 to add the 6.2-mile Hillsboro extension, bringing the total section 5309 share to $590,000,000. FTA formula and flexible funds totaling $74,000,000 are also being used in this project. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $264,700,000 in new start Funds. To date, $264,700,000 has been obligated with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. The FFGA funding schedule calls for $108,000,000 in new starts funding in fiscal year 1996. The Committee provided additional funds to enable this project to catch up on shortfalls in its prior-years allocations. An additional $217,400,000 is needed in fiscal year 1997 and 1998. The project received an ISTEA earmark of $515,000,000.

Sacramento.—The Committee recommends no funding for the Sacramento south corridor project. The House provided $2,000,000 for this project. The Sacramento Regional Transit District [RTD] is proposing an 6-mile, $223,000,000 LRT line on the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way. The local share commitment to this project is 20 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $6 per new passenger trip. Through fiscal year 1995, $1,980,000 has been appropriated for this project. To date, $1,980,000 has been obligated to the project, with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. FTA has not given a financial rating. ISTEA authorized $26,000,000 for this project.

Salt Lake City LRT.—The Committee recommends $14,519,000 for the Salt Lake City south LRT project. The House provided only $5,000,000 for this project. The Committee disagrees with the

House's restriction on the use of these funds and has deleted the restriction from the bill.

The Committee supports local decisionmaking on the use of these funds consistent with the projects full funding grant agreement. We anticipate receiving future funding requests from the administration regarding this project. The project sponsors believe that this project will address the increased transit demands that accompany current and future economic and demographic growth in the Salt Lake metropolitan area.

The Utah Transit Authority [UTA] plans to construct a 15-mile light rail transit [LRT] line from downtown Salt Lake City to suburban areas to the south. The LRT line would operate at-grade on city streets in the downtown and utilize a railroad right-of-way already owned by UTA to the south of downtown. The project is currently in the final design stage. The local share commitment to this project is 20 percent. The cost-effectiveness index is $4 per new passenger trip. The total cost of the project is estimated to be $312,500,000 with a section 5309 share of $237,400,000. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $29,000,000 (including $15,520,000 in funds from fiscal years prior to ISTEA) for right-of-way acquisition, engineering, and design. To date, $29,000,000 has been obligated to this project with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. This project received an ISTEA earmark of $131,000,000.

San Juan, Puerto Rico Tren-Urbano.—The Committee recommends no funding for the San Juan Tren-Urbano project. The House provided $15,000,000 for this project. The Puerto Rico Department of Transportation and Public Works [DTPW] plans to construct an 11.8-mile, 16-station, $965,000,000 light rail line which would connect the major activity centers in the San Juan region, including Santurce, Hato Rey, Rio Piedras, and Bayamon. A second phase would extend the rail system east to Carolina and northwest further into Santurce. DTPW is currently preparing an EIS and preliminary engineering for the first phase. The finance plan envisions section 5309 funding of $322,000,000 (33 percent) with other Federal funding of $240,000,000 (25 percent) and a local share commitment of $403,000,000 (42 percent). The cost-effectiveness index is $4 per new passenger trip. FTA has assigned a financial rating of high to this project. Through fiscal year 1995, $4,960,000 has been appropriated for this project. To date, $4,960,000 has been obligated with no prior-year appropriations remaining unobligated. The project is not authorized in ISTEA.

San Francisco BART Airport/Tasman extensions.—The Committee recommends $22,620,000 for the San Francisco BART Airport/Tasman extensions. The House provided $10,000,000 for this project and restricted its use to the BART Airport extension. The Committee disagrees with the restriction and has deleted it. The BART extension to San Francisco International Airport is a 6.4-mile, three-station extension from Colma to San Francisco International Airport and Milpitas. The project is now in the preliminary engineering stage. Costs for constructing the project range from $847,000,000 to $1,269,000, depending upon the alternative. The cost-effectiveness index is $25 per new passenger trip for the locally preferred alternative. FTA has assigned a financial rating

of low due to apparent shortfalls in the bay area's current overall capital financing plan. The Tasman project is a 12.4-mile surface light rail transit [LRT] line from northeast San Jose to downtown Mountain View, connecting to the existing northern terminus of the Guadalupe corridor LRT system near Great America Parkway in the city of Santa Clara. The $500,000,000 project would also connect with the Caltrain commuter rail system at the downtown Mountain View station. Preliminary engineering was completed in August 1992, the final EIS was approved in December 1992, and final design was started in May 1993. The local share commitment to this project would flow from a 0.5-cent sales tax. However, the tax has been invalidated by a State court and a ruling on an appeal to restore the tax has not yet been issued. For this reason, FTA has assigned the project a low rating. The cost-effectiveness index for the Tasman project is $33 per new passenger trip. Overall, $205,400,000 of the $512,750,000 authorized by ISTEA in section 5309 new starts funds has been appropriated by Congress for the San Francisco Bay region through fiscal year 1995. Consistent with the ISTEA legislation, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has allocated these funds among the Colma BART extension, BART airport project, and Tasman LRT project and obligated $172,200,000 to date, including $55,900,000 to Colma, $55,500,000 to the airport extension and $60,800,000 to the Tasman project. Only a $33,200,000 allocation to Tasman has yet to be obligated. The affected agencies are currently working with MTC to determine future allocations.

Seattle-Renton-Tacoma commuter rail.—The Committee recommends no new funding for the Seattle-Renton-Tacoma commuter rail project. The House also provided no funds for this project. The three-county Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority [RTA] Board has adopted a master plan for transit which includes commuter rail service between Seattle and Tacoma as well as additional commuter rail, LRT, and bus service. The Seattle-Tacoma service would operate along the approximately 40 miles of track between the two cities. In addition to Seattle and Tacoma, service would be provided to Tukwila, Kent, Auburn, Summer, Puyallup, and Renton. The project is at the planning stage. The local share commitment to this project is not yet known. Through fiscal year 1995, Congress has appropriated $22,640,000 for the project. To date, $20,760,000 in prior-year appropriations remains unobligated, including $15,190,000 from fiscal year 1993 which has been reprogrammed according to existing law. Information concerning costs and benefits, cost-effectiveness index, and financial commitment is not yet available. This project received an ISTEA earmark of $25,000,000.

St. Louis Metrolink (St. Clair County, IL) corridor.—The Committee recommends $13,000,000 for new railcars for St. Louis Metrolink, but no funding for the St. Clair County corridor LRT. The House provided $8,000,000 for railcars and $2,000,000 for design of the Illinois extension. The East-West Gateway Coordinating Council [EWGCC] has completed a major investment study of transit alternatives for the corridor between downtown East St. Louis, Illinois, and the vicinity of Scott Air Force Base. The selected alternative is a 24.8-mile LRT extension with a capital cost of about

$400,000,000. The local share commitment to this project is 20 percent, and a low/medium rating for financial capacity has been assigned by FTA. The cost-effectiveness index is $30 per new passenger trip. Through fiscal year 1995, $14,440,000 has been appropriated to this project. To date, $450,000 has been obligated and $13,990,000 remains unobligated. This project is not authorized in ISTEA.

Tampa-Lakeland commuter rail.—The Committee recommends no funding for the Tampa-Lakeland commuter rail project. The House provided $1,000,000 for this project. The Tampa Commuter Rail Authority is considering the establishment of transit service in a 32-mile corridor between Lakeland and Tampa, FL. One alternative is commuter rail on an existing freight line. The Tampa Commuter Rail Authority was established after a number of previous studies recommended that a transit system may help relieve traffic on I–4 between Lakeland and Tampa, FL. The Tampa Commuter Rail Authority will be completing a major investment study to develop information on transit alternatives in the corridor. The study is expected to be completed in mid-1996. In fiscal year 1995, Congress appropriated $500,000 for this corridor. The $500,000 has not yet been obligated. Pending completion of the study, there is no information on the nature of the project, its costs and benefits, the local share commitment, the cost-effectiveness index, or the financial plan. This project is not authorized in ISTEA.

Whitehall Ferry Terminal, New York.—The Committee recommends no funding for the Whitehall Ferry Terminal study. The House provided $5,000,000 for this project. The New York City Economic Development Corp. and the New York City Department of Transportation have proposed the redesign and reconstruction of the Staten Island Ferry's Whitehall Terminal in downtown Manhattan. The terminal was largely destroyed by fire in 1991 and has been operating out of interim facilities since then. In fiscal year 1995, Congress appropriated $2,480,000 for construction. To date, the $2,480,000 remains unobligated. Information on the cost of the project, the local share commitment to the project, and the financial plan is not yet available. The project is not authorized in ISTEA.

Wisconsin (Chicago) Central commuter [Metra].—The Committee recommends $14,400,000 for the Wisconsin Central project, the same as the House. This funding will complete the project. This project will extend Metra commuter rail service from downtown Chicago to the Wisconsin border (at Antioch, IL) via the Wisconsin Central rail line. The project is being implemented in two phases. Phase I of the project (already fully funded) included land acquisition, track and signal upgrades, station platform facilities, and other operations-related improvements associated with commuter service requirements. Phase II, costing $18,000,000, consists of measures, such as double-tracking and sidings, to improve passenger service on tracks that are heavily used for freight service. Phase I is under construction; phase II is in the preliminary engineering stage. The local share commitment to phase II is 22 percent. This project is exempt from new start criteria, since less than $25,000,000 of section 5309 funding is required, and thus, a cost-effectiveness index has not been calculated. Congress has appro-

priated $10,420,000 for phase I through fiscal year 1995. This $10,400,000 has been fully obligated. This project is not authorized in ISTEA.

MASS TRANSIT CAPITAL FUND

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	($1,500,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(1,700,000,000)
House allowance	(2,000,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(1,700,000,000)

The bill includes $1,700,000,000 to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authority provided in section 21 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended. This is the total amount requested by the President's budget submittal.

INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS—TRANSIT

Appropriations, 1995	$48,030,000
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

Funding in 1995 exhausts the Federal commitment to transit capital projects substituted for previously withdrawn segments of the interstate highway system under the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 103(e)(4). No funds were requested by the administration in 1996 to carry out the provisions of section 1045 of Public Law 102–240 given funding provided in 1995.

WASHINGTON METRO

Appropriations, 1995	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 1996	[1] (200,000,000)
House allowance	200,000,000
Committee recommendation	170,000,000

[1] This account is proposed to be replaced by funding through the Unified Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program [UTIIP].

Public Law 96–184 (Stark-Harris legislation) enacted January 3, 1980, authorized a total of $1,700,000,000 for construction on the Washington Metrorail System. All of the funds authorized under Stark-Harris have been appropriated. In addition, the National Capital Transportation Amendments of 1990, Public Law 101–551, authorized another $1,300,000,000 in Federal capital assistance. Through fiscal year 1995, $649,700,000 has been appropriated, leaving a balance of $650,300,000.

The Committee has reduced the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority's budget request by 15 percent from $200,000,000 to $170,000,000. This reduction is in keeping with the steep reductions that transit authorities all over the Nation will experience in Federal transit aid during fiscal year 1996. The Committee understands that WMATA would achieve savings by completing its fast track construction schedule as planned; however, this is equally true for other new start transit systems. Other new start systems have had to reprioritize their needs, and seek addi-

tional sources of funding when Federal appropriations fell short. Fairness dictates that WMATA not be insulated from the need to readjust its funding schedules to meet Federal appropriations targets.

The House bill also includes a new title, "National Capital Area Interest Arbitration Standards Act of 1995." The Committee has deleted this authorizing legislation from the bill.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

(VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	$5,000,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

Section 40131 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 authorizes $10,000,000 to establish programs for capital improvements and studies to prevent crime in public transportation. The administration requested $5,000,000 for these purposes in transit in fiscal year 1996. The Committee received no allocation to enable it to fund programs under this account.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Capital grants availability.—The Committee concurs with the House provision (sec. 321) limiting the availability of earmarked capital grants to 3 years. If not obligated after that period of time, the funds would be available for allocation to other transit projects.

Bus overhauls.—The Committee concurs with the House general provision allowing the use of formula capital funds to be used for major bus overhauls (sec. 333). This provision will help maintain the transit fleet, and preserve assets paid for with Federal tax dollars. The provision takes effect the second half of fiscal year 1996 (after March 31, 1996).

The transit industry has sought this provision to better allocate scarce operating dollars, and prolong the useful life of transit buses. This provision will promote good maintenance practices and encourage the use of vehicles to the maximum limit of their economic lives. Flexibility in the use of capital funds for bus overhauls will discourage premature bus replacement that is likely to result from large cuts in operating aid.

The Committee understands that the entire transit industry is expected to spend about $151,000,000 in operating aid to overhaul buses this year. If capital funds could be used for such overhauls, the industry projects $147,000,000, including State and local match, to be used for bus overhauls. Some very large transit systems would continue to use operating funds for overhauls. The amount that could be capitalized in large areas over 1,000,000 population is estimated to be $125,000,000, for medium-sized areas between 200,000 and 1,000,000 population the amount would be $15,000,000, and for small urbanized areas below 200,000 population the amount would be $7,000,000.

WMATA oversight.—The Committee has deleted the House provision (sec. 341) requiring that FTA's oversight of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority be conducted from the agen-

cy's Washington, DC, offices. FTA has elected to transfer management and oversight of WMATA's transit grant program to the Philadelphia regional office because regional offices are organizationally structured for the primary function of serving their respective grantees, whereas FTA headquarters organization and staff is focused on policy, guidance, and overall management. In anticipation of the additional WMATA oversight duties, FTA has increased the staffing level in the Philadelphia regional office by two FTE positions.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is a wholly owned Government corporation established by the act of May 13, 1954, responsible for the operation, maintenance, and development of the United States portion of the seaway between Montreal and Lake Erie.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	$10,229,000
Budget estimate, 1996	10,243,000
House allowance	10,190,500
Committee recommendation	10,150,000

The Corporation's operations program provides for operation of all facilities, for maintenance—including major items which are deferred to the nonnavigation season, for planning and development activities, and for undertaking various capital improvements to upgrade and modernize its facilities.

Appropriations are made to the Seaway Corporation from the harbor maintenance trust fund established by Public Law 99–662. These appropriations are the primary source of financing for the operations and maintenance activities of the Corporation.

The Congress authorizes the Corporation to make expenditures from available funds and borrowing authority, and to enter into contracts without regard to fiscal year limitations as are necessary to carry out the programs set forth in its budget.

For fiscal year 1996, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,150,000. This is $93,000 less than the budget request and $40,500 less than the House allowance. The Committee does not direct that this reduction be made from any specific line item of the fiscal year 1996 budget request. In recent years, however, there are three areas for which costs have either grown or remained at the same levels without what the Committee considers adequate justification: consulting services, travel and transportation of persons, and personnel compensation at the Seaway's Washington, DC, office (despite the fact that the number of staff at the Washington office is decreasing). These areas should be carefully considered when making adjustments to the fiscal year 1996 budget.

GPS vessel traffic service.—The Committee has included bill language prohibiting the use of appropriated harbor maintenance trust funds or the Seaway Corporation's financial reserve fund in fiscal year 1996 for design, development, or procurement of a global

positioning system vessel traffic service system. This moratorium on the GPS vessel traffic service system is intended to provide the Seaway Corporation time to prepare a detailed study on possibilities for privatization of such service. The Seaway Administrator is thereby directed to prepare, with assistance and input from the U.S. Coast Guard, a study of possible options for privatizing the procurement and operation of vessel traffic services on the American portions of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The study should be received by the Senate and House Appropriations Committees on or before May 1, 1996. This issue was raised by the Senate Appropriations Committee in the fiscal year 1996 hearing record. Chairman Hatfield asked the Seaway Corporation:

> *Question.* Has any consideration been given to privatizing the operation of the Seaway vessel traffic service system? Please outline arguments for and against privatization, and give the American Seaway Corporation's view on the matter, as well as the Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway Authority's, if known.

The Seaway Corporation's response follows:

> Answer. No thought has been given to privatizing the VTS program, a Government-controlled function.

In the current climate of budget austerity, this is an inadequate response to the chairman's inquiry.

Washington, DC, and Massena seaway offices.—In many ways, the future path of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is uncertain. The Seaway Corporation is without an Administrator at the present time. The administration has proposed authorizing legislation that would make the Corporation an independent agency. And there are preliminary discussions regarding combining the Canadian Seaway Authority and the American Seaway Corporation into a single, binational seaway entity.

The day-to-day operations and maintenance of the seaway are performed in Massena, NY. Given this fact, the comparative staffing and nonpersonnel costs for the two offices are somewhat disproportionate. The seaway projects a 1996 staffing level of 164 FTE's: 145 persons in the Massena, NY, office (88 percent) and 19 persons in the Washington, DC, office (12 percent). However, the Massena office's personnel costs (salary and benefits for the 145 employees) are projected to be $6,780,000 (83 percent), and the Washington office's personnel costs are projected to be $1,416,000 (17 percent). For nonpersonnel costs (travel, transportation, communications, utilities, printing and reproduction, Government services, supplies, equipment, and structures), the Washington office is projected to require $565,000 (18 percent) and the Massena office $2,500,000 (82 percent).

The relative costs associated with maintaining two seaway offices have been a concern of the Committee's for some time. The seaway is directed to prepare a detailed analysis of the respective offices' costs, both under the Corporation's current DOT agency status, and projected for independent Government agency status. Assume current staffing distribution, and break out all types of office costs, with a brief description of each cost category. Please also prepare

a study of costs associated with shifting personnel from the Washington, DC, office to Massena, under two different scenarios: (1) Assuming the Seaway Corporation remains within the Department of Transportation, outline all costs associated with moving the Offices of Communications, Development and Logistics, and Marketing from Washington, DC, to Massena, leaving a skeleton staff of 8 to 10 persons in the DOT Nassif Building; and (2) assuming the Seaway Corporation becomes an independent Government agency, outline the costs associated with moving the same group of offices to Massena. This report shall be provided to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees on or before January 31, 1996.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

The Research and Special Programs Administration [RSPA] was established by the Secretary of Transportation's organizational changes dated July 20, 1977, and serves as a research, analytical, and technical development arm of the Department for multimodal research and development, as well as special programs. Particular emphasis is given to pipeline transportation and the transportation of hazardous cargo by all modes. In 1996, resources are requested for the management and execution of the Offices of Hazardous Materials Safety, Airline Statistics, Emergency Transportation, Pipeline Safety, program and administrative support, the Transportation Safety Institute [TSI], and the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center [VNTSC]. Funds are also requested for the emergency preparedness grants program.

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1995	$25,995,100
Budget estimate, 1996	29,249,000
House allowance	26,030,000
Committee recommendation	24,281,000

The Committee has provided a total of $24,281,000 for the "Research and special programs" account.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations:

	Fiscal year 1995 enacted	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Hazardous materials safety	$12,793,000	$12,782,000	$12,600,000	$12,987,000
(Positions)	(113)	(111)	(111)	(113)
Aviation information management [1]	$2,449,000	.....	$2,322,000	.....
(Positions)	(29)	.....	(22)	.....
Emergency transportation	$1,312,000	$1,301,000	$1,086,000	$962,000
(Positions)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)
Research and technology	$2,515,000	$7,604,000	$3,209,000	$3,451,000
(Positions)	(13)	(14)	(13)	(12)
Program and administrative support	$6,926,000	$7,562,000	$7,394,000	$7,292,000
(Positions)	(45)	(46)	(46)	(44)
Accountwide adjustment	.....	.....	−$581,000	−$411,000
Total, research and special programs	$25,995,000	$29,249,000	$26,030,000	$24,281,000

	Fiscal year 1995 enacted	Fiscal year 1996 estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
(Positions)	(207)	(178)	(199)	(176)

[1] The administration requested $2,282,000 for this function.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

Hazardous materials safety [HMS] administers a nationwide program of safety regulations to fulfill the Secretary's duty to protect the Nation from the risks to life, health, and property that are inherent in the transportation of hazardous materials by water, air, highway, and railroad.

HMS plans, implements, and manages the hazardous materials transportation program consisting of information systems, research and analysis, inspection and enforcement, rulemaking support, training and information dissemination, and emergency procedures.

Research and analysis.—The Committee has provided an additional $44,000 above the budget request to enhance regulatory analysis and research activities to support cost-effective rulemakings. This adjustment will restore funding to the fiscal year 1995 level.

Inspection and enforcement.—The Committee has provided an additional $40,000 above the budget request to restore funding for the HM Specialist Internship Program as part of the OHMS program. The Committee does not support funding for this program in the emergency preparedness grant program, as proposed. The intern program provides State and local officials with first-hand experience on the Federal enforcement and regulatory program, while providing OHMS with a State and local perspective needed to improve Federal/State hazmat partnerships. The HM Specialist Internship Program is primarily geared toward enforcement personnel and is not targeted toward emergency response concerns. Funds for the intern program should not have to compete for the limited funds available in the grant program.

Rulemaking support.—The Committee notes that a number of important safety rulemakings, including intrastate transportation, rail tank car safety, and infectious substances, have not yet been finalized. The Committee wants to ensure that forthcoming OHMS regulations will be cost effective and are based on careful scientific and economic analyses. To achieve this objective and to help OHMS eliminate or improve other regulations, the Committee has provided an additional $116,000 for rulemaking support. This adjustment will maintain rulemaking activities at the fiscal year 1995 level.

Hazmat training.—The Committee does not agree with the RSPA request to reduce significantly compliance training for State and local enforcement officials. Effective enforcement requires a sufficient number of adequately trained personnel to provide a credible deterrent to noncompliance. The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 to restore these essential training activities to the fiscal year 1995 level.

RSPA personnel.—The Committee denies the request to eliminate two FTP and three FTE from the Office of Hazardous Materials Safety [OHMS]. These positions were originally funded to im-

plement the Sanitary Food Transportation Act [SFTA], but these experts also have been used to work on the substantial regulatory backlog facing the OHMS. The Committee asserts that these personnel are still needed to develop cost-effective regulations and work on the SFTA. The Committee notes that the number of fundable positions allocated to OHMS has been reduced during the last few years, while the workload has only increased to meet the requirements of several new statutes. In contrast, RSPA's Office of Management and Administration [OMA] has been minimally affected by downsizing and has not shared its proportionate reduction with other RSPA offices. Consequently, the Committee recommends a decrease of two FTP and three FTE from OMA. This action would be in keeping with the Administration's goal to reduce administrative support in selected areas by 50 percent by fiscal year 1999.

Hazardous materials enforcement.—The Committee commends the Office of Hazardous Materials Enforcement for the increase in the vitality and vigor of its compliance program. For example, this Office has increased the number of enforcement cases initiated, the number of cased closed, and the number of penalties collected. In addition, this Office is seeking an array of means to improve the timing of its followup visits to companies that were judged not to be in compliance with the hazardous materials transportation regulations [HMTR]. The Committee appreciates the fact that the regional OHMS offices are assisting State and local enforcement officials and conducting joint inspections when appropriate. Such efforts should be expanded whenever possible.

The Committee has reviewed the civil penalty enforcement guidelines for the HMTR that were prepared in response to Senate Report 103–150. These guidelines promote consistency in the implementation of Federal law and provide industry with basic information that the OHMS uses in initiating its penalty assessment process. The Committee applauds RSPA's response to the Committee's directive and urges the agency to disseminate this penalty guideline widely throughout the regulated community.

In summary the Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request.

Hazardous materials:	
Registration system	−$182,000
Research and development	−23,000
International program	−40,000
Research and analysis	+44,000
Inspection and enforcement	+40,000
Rulemaking support	+116,000
Information system	−50,000
Hazardous materials training	+100,000
Two FTP's/three FTE's	+200,000

AVIATION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

The Aviation Information Management [AIM] Program provides financial and statistical economic data on individual air carrier operations and the air transportation industry. The AIM provides airline data and special project data services to DOT programs and users. It also arranges for access to the data by non-DOT parties through its reports reference room, the RSPA's center for transpor-

tation information at the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, and private sector information firms.

The AIM Program became part of RSPA in 1985 to provide separation of its administration and direction from its users in the Office of the Secretary [OST] and the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA]. In fiscal year 1991, the airline tariffs function was transferred from OST to RSPA. Beginning in fiscal year 1995, the Department of Transportation transferred the AIM Program to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics consistent with BTS' primary role in statistical oversight. In fiscal year 1996, funding for the AIM Program has been shifted to BTS and OST.

The Airline Tariffs Program is responsible for administering the Department's program of air carrier tariff filings. Tariffs are filed in accordance with the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and 14 CFR part 221 of the Department's regulations. U.S. and foreign air carriers must file the tariffs, setting passenger fares, cargo rates, additional charges, and the rules related to the application of the fares and rates, where the tariffs are applicable to international air transportation.

EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION

Emergency transportation [ET] programs provide support to the Secretary of Transportation for his statutory and administrative responsibilities in the area of transportation civil emergency preparedness and response. The office develops and coordinates the Department's policies, plans, and programs, in headquarters and the field to provide for emergency preparedness.

ET is responsible for implementing the Transportation Department's National Security Program initiatives, including an assessment of the transportation implications of the changing global threat. The Office is also charged with the development of crisis management plans and the implementation of these plans nationally and regionally in an emergency.

The Committee recommends $962,000 for emergency transportation, including a reduction of $339,000 for the crisis management center. Last year, the Committee supported a one-time increase in funds to modernize the center. Given the existence of the Federal Aviation Administration Operations Center, U.S. Coast Guard emergency commands, the National Response Center, and the Federal Emergency Management Administration, the Committee maintains that the funds recommended herein will be more than sufficient for the Office of Emergency Transportation to conduct its functions.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

The Office of Research and Technology [ORT] assists in the definition of research policy, maintains oversight over research and development programs conducted by the Department, and provides coordination of research among the modes. This mission is accomplished by providing staff support to the Director of Technology Deployment (in OST), as Chairman of the DOT Research and Technology Coordinating Council. ORT is also charged with assuring that transportation research from around the country is made available in useful form to Federal, State, and local elected and ap-

pointed officials, the transportation community, and academia. The program also provides program development and research dissemination assistance in the system of the University Transportation Centers Program.

The Committee has not provided the amount requested for R&D planning and management. The Committee does not want to create what amounts to a separate and new research institution within the Department under RSPA's leadership, and furthermore, the current budgetary situation does not allow for such an increase. Furthermore, because a strong R&D program is needed to advance transportation safety and technology, the Committee has recommended sufficient R&D funding in each of the modes.

The Director for Technology Deployment, the Research and Technology Coordinating Council, the Research and Development Steering Committee, each of the modal administrations, and investigators working at the Volpe Center (who collectively work on all modes of transportation) should continue to work diligently to improve research coordination, to further intermodal research activities, and to promote technology transfer.

With the funds provided to RSPA, the Committee maintains that the Director for Technology Deployment and the Administrator will be able to contribute toward these objectives. The highest priority for these funds should be: (1) to write and distribute an improved Surface Transportation R&D plan; (2) to ensure that transportation issues receive sufficient attention in the deliberations of the National Science and Technology Council; and (3) to ensure coordination of transportation-related research within the DOT and within the Federal Government.

The RSPA Administrator and the Director for Technology Deployment should keep the Committee more informed on their contributions to the National Science and Technology Council and on technology deployment, transfer and coordination activities at DOT. To this end, the Committee requests a detailed letter outlining the scope and nature of these activities and their results to be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before March 1, 1996.

The Committee has carefully reviewed the second edition of the Surface Transportation Research and Development Plan that was required by section 6009(b) of the ISTEA. Within the funds provided for R&D planning and management, the Committee expects that the third edition will truly be a strategic plan that details in broad terms the future direction of the Department's research for the next 5 years. The plan should present evidence of careful intermodal coordination, integration, and analysis. Furthermore, the plan should reflect substantial guidance provided by the Research and Technology Coordinating Council and the Research and Technology Steering Committee.

The Committee believes that the marketing of research results and outreach activities should be an inherent part of each agency's functions and sees little need for RSPA to develop and implement duplicative efforts. Thus, the Committee agrees with the House recommendation that no additional funds beyond the amount spent during fiscal year 1995 should be used for technology promotion.

The Committee approves the transfer of one position to the Office of the Secretary for Radionavigation R&D. The Committee's recommendation does not include the two new positions requested for research and technology activities. This adjustment leaves 12 positions in the Office of Research, Technology, and Analysis.

The Committee proposes to eliminate funding for the position of Associate Administrator for Research, Technology and Analysis. This position has been vacant for more than 7 months and is unlikely to be filled until a decision is reached on the Department's reorganization proposal. Many of the responsibilities of this Office are now being implemented by the Director for Technology Deployment in the Office of the Secretary.

In summary the Committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request.

Research and technology

Reductions:	
FTE's −2	−$106,000
Planning and development	−2,900,000
Promotion activities	−847,000
Deployment	−300,000

PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The program support function provides legal, financial, management, and administrative support to the operating offices within RSPA. These support activities include executive direction (Office of the Administrator), program and policy support, civil rights and special programs, legal services and support, and management and administration.

The Committee denies funds for the personnel support contract for the Office of Management and Administration and for the support contract for the Office of Policy and Program Support. Secretarial and other staff support is available throughout RSPA to help conduct the activities for which contract funds were sought.

Funding for RSPA's information resources management activity has been increasing rapidly, going from $150,000 during fiscal year 1993 to $425,000 in fiscal year 1995. To bring this expenditure more in line with fiscal constraints, the Committee recommends $400,000, which is $70,000 less than the budget request.

Accountwide adjustments.—The Committee agrees with the House decision to reduce funding for training (−$109,000) and equipment (−$302,000) and agrees with these reductions. The Committee is concerned that some of the training funds requested would pay for specialized courses that are beginning to detract from the implementation of the basic safety and technology functions of RSPA. In order to limit the frequency of unnecessary training activities, the Committee recommends that a substantial portion of the reductions in operating expenses be taken from the training budget, especially funds used to support courses that do not strengthen enforcement and regulatory capabilities. The RSPA Administrator shall ensure that this reduction does not affect the availability of funds for hazardous materials inspections or assistance to State hazardous materials personnel.

VOLPE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS CENTER

The Committee has reviewed the work acceptance criteria now governing the activities conducted at the Volpe Center. These criteria should reduce the abuses that were previously noted by the inspector general. The Committee asserts that timely approval of proposals submitted to Volpe is essential for efficient R&D management. Given the workload of the RSPA Administrator, the Committee strongly supports efforts to streamline the work acceptance processes by delegating project approval authority back to the Director of the Volpe Center.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	$37,340,000
Budget estimate, 1996	42,418,000
House allowance	29,941,000
Committee recommendation	32,973,000

The Research and Special Programs Administration is also responsible for the Department's Pipeline Safety Program. This activity was funded as a separate account for the first time in fiscal year 1988 and is entirely financed by user fees assessed to the pipeline operators and by fees paid to the oilspill liability trust fund [OSLTF].

Included under this account are the operations activity providing for the salaries and expenses and the supervisory and management functions for pipeline safety regulatory and enforcement programs. Also included is research and development to support the Pipeline Safety Program and grants-in-aid to State agencies that conduct a Pipeline Safety Program. The budget request included $2,698,000 for activities to be funded from the OSLTF which has been included by both the House and Senate.

For pipeline safety activities within RSPA, the Committee recommends $32,973,000.

Pipeline safety personnel.—The Committee disagrees with the House allocation, which abrogates an agreement reached in the 1995 conference report regarding personnel for the Office of Pipeline Safety [OPS]. The conferees agreed to include funding to support an additional 33 full-time permanent positions and 18 full-time equivalent staff in fiscal year 1995. The Committee's recommendation includes the funds requested to annualize the additional 15 FTE's during fiscal year 1996 for a total of 105 FTE's and 105 FTP's. These additional inspectors are needed to improve compliance with the safety regulations, to work with industry to further the purposes of pipeline safety and environmental protection, and to ensure effective oversight of the State grant program.

These additional personnel will address current shortfalls in the OPS inspection program. For example, due to the limited number of Federal inspectors, only about 10 percent of all reported accidents are investigated by Federal inspectors. In addition, OPS regional offices have typically been unable to meet their inspection goals because of a shortage of inspectors. Additional personnel would increase the ability of OPS to meet an inspection interval of 2 years for high-risk pipelines versus the current 4 year average.

Furthermore, needed inspection of new pipeline construction and renewal could be performed. OPS would be able to inspect additional low stress pipelines, a new area of responsibility that has substantially increased the number of pipeline miles subject to OPS jurisdiction. The proposed risk management demonstration projects will only add to the inspection workload of OPS.

Operating expenses.—The Committee recommends a reduction in the operating expenses of OPS of $306,000 and requires that the funds necessary to conduct inspections and to work with State partners receive the highest priority for allocation.

Information systems operations.—The OPS will need substantial information resources to develop and justify future regulatory improvements and to monitor demonstrations of regulatory flexibility that are likely to be forthcoming under pipeline reauthorization legislation. However, because of budgetary limitations, the Committee recommends $1,502,000 for information systems, which is $250,000 less than the amount requested.

Risk assessment and technical studies.—The Committee recommends $1,750,000 for risk assessment and technical studies. This allowance includes the $250,00 requested for regulatory analysis as well as an additional $250,000 to improve the adequacy of cost benefit analyses and risk assessments which the OPS should be conducting.

Field engineering support.—The Committee recommends $300,000 for continuation of this activity in fiscal year 1996. The funds provided shall be used to provide technological expertise or testing facilities that OPS lacks. Such needs as metallurgical testing, fracture mechanics, welding analysis, and radiography assistance are areas for which such assistance would be warranted. The Committee does not agree that these funds should be used for drug testing activities, as proposed by the House committee. This function has historically been conducted using Federal inspectors and headquarters personnel, is closely related to possible enforcement activities, and should be conducted only by Federal personnel rather than by contractors. The Committee expects any available funds from prior year obligations for contracted field engineering support to be used in fiscal year 1996 for continued work in these areas.

Training and information dissemination.—The Committee recommends $925,000 for training and information dissemination, which is $54,000 more than requested, but the same amount that was appropriated in fiscal year 1995. Federal and State inspectors must receive adequate training to ensure a quality compliance program. To be certified to stay in the grant program, State inspectors must complete specified training requirements. The Committee disagrees with the House recommendation that the risk management curriculum should be postponed. The development of these courses will require a substantial lead time and this information is needed to help inspectors make better evaluations consistent with the existing OPS waiver authority and forthcoming changes in authorizing law.

Mapping.—The mapping project will provide OPS with location information on pipelines so that the agency can more efficiently and wisely make the safety and environmental protection decisions necessary to execute its mission. Accurate maps will assist in re-

sponse efforts during accidents or natural disasters, especially those maps that show the location of high density populations or environmentally sensitive areas. The mapping project will help OPS to determine the risks pipelines pose and where prevention and monitoring will do the most good. The project responds to the 1992 statutory requirement to better protect environmentally sensitive areas through which pipelines run. Pipeline maps prepared by industry are not integrated in a comprehensive manner and do not meet the needs of the agency.

Although OPS has been working closely with industry and its State partners through the mapping quality action team, OPS has not yet chosen the final strategy to procure the necessary mapping system. Consequently, the total costs to acquire and maintain the system have not yet been determined. Because of the value of mapping and the need to maintain close oversight over this project, the Committee wants to be kept abreast of progress on this activity. To this end, the RSPA Administrator should send a detailed letter to both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before April 1, 1996, specifying the final costs of the project and the approach to be taken to meet the needs of the agency at the least cost. Because of budgetary limitations, the Committee recommends $800,000 for the mapping initiative.

Public education campaign.—The Committee directs that, before funds for the national public information campaign are obligated, OPS submit a definitive plan for allocation of these funds to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. The plan shall detail how this campaign will contribute to pipeline safety and be coordinated with similar non-Federal activities. The Committee requests that this plan also be submitted for comment to the appropriate pipeline advisory committees.

Nondestructive evaluation technology.—The Committee recommends $1,000,000 for NDE work, which is $1,100,000 less than the amount requested. The goal of this research is to advance technology that detects dents and flaws and to determine the adequacy of repair and remediation strategies used to return pipelines to service. These funds are necessary to ensure that OPS helps advance this useful technology, maintains continuity in its research program, and provides OPS increased technical expertise to review technical decisions made by pipeline operators and to deal with regulatory initiatives. OPS will work cooperatively with the pipeline industry to ensure that its NDE research and development focuses on unresolved and conflicting technical issues and does not duplicate industry work.

Information systems development.—Because of budgetary constraints, the Committee recommends $255,000 for information systems development, which is $400,000 less than the amount requested.

Research and development.—The Committee wants OPS to strategically plan the future course and direction of its R&D program. When asked what technical advances have resulted from research sponsored during the last 3 fiscal years by the OPS, the agency only cited studies on supervisory control and data acquisition methods. OPS indicated that none of the research projects planned for fiscal year 1996 support near-term rulemaking. The Committee,

therefore, directs the Administrator to submit before June 1, 1996, to both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, a 5-year strategic plan for the Office of Pipeline Safety R&D program. The Committee has requested similar plans of other agencies of the department and believes that they serve a useful purpose for both the agency and the Committee. This plan will ensure that there is a solid foundation on which future cost-effective regulations can be based. The Administrator also will ensure that OPS, as well as other offices, are placing R&D reports into the National Technical Information Service.

A draft of the 5-year plan should be submitted for review and comment by the appropriate pipeline advisory committees. The Committee disagrees with RSPA's assertion that it would be premature to request comments on any aspect of the budget request until OMB formally approves the budget. The Committee notes that other DOT agencies discuss their draft R&D submittals referencing specific initiatives and proposed funding levels at public advisory committee meetings.

OPS enforcement program.—During the last few years, Congress took the initiative to either recommend new pipeline inspectors that were not requested in the budget or to approve those that were requested. The Committee expected that the addition of new inspectors would have resulted in substantial improvements in the vitality and effectiveness of the OPS enforcement program. Unfortunately, this has not been the case. For example, during the last 2 years, OPS data indicate that the number of pipeline incidents, number of pipeline fatalities and injuries, and amount of associated property damage has been increasing. During this same period, the number of warning letters issued, the amount of civil penalties assessed and collected, the number of enforcement cases closed, and the number of accident investigations decreased. The Committee directs that RSPA Administrator to review the targeting, vitality and vigor of the inspection and civil penalty process and to respond with a detailed letter to be submitted before December 1, 1995, to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees as to what steps will be taken to improve the enforcement program and to improve compliance.

Although the amount of civil penalties proposed and collected is only one means to promote compliance, it is usually an effective one. The Committee understands that OPS is working on other measures of the effectiveness of its compliance program. The Committee strongly encourages these efforts and looks forward to receiving data on other measures besides the ones cited above.

OILSPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND

The Committee recommends $2,698,000 to be derived from the oilspill liability trust fund for implementation of the OPS responsibilities under the OPA. RSPA has concluded that as a result of industry improving its facility response plans and participating in spill drills, the pipeline industry has greatly improved its overall preparedness. The funds provided will allow exercising of these plans, publication of a lessons learned document, review of response plans with significant changes, and a determination of a

baseline assessing the ability of industry to respond to specific pipeline releases.

OPS has completed its initial review and approval of more than 1,100 spill response plans. The Committee is aware that some State agencies and industry groups pay for drills independent of RSPA support. OPS personnel should make continued use of such exercises to reduce Federal expenditures on similar drills. The Committee supports OPS efforts to work closely with other Federal agencies in crafting a single response plan that a company can use to meet all Federal requirements for oilspill prevention and response.

Pipeline grant program.—The Committee recommends $13,500,000 for the natural gas and hazardous liquid pipeline safety grants, which is $1,200,000 less than the amount requested, but the same as the fiscal year 1995 appropriation. The Committee has not provided any funds for separate risk assessment grants because legislation allowing these grants to go to other entities besides State pipeline agencies has not yet been authorized.

In addition to conducting conventional pipeline safety audits, the funds provided may be used to conduct risk assessments or to build the capability needed for such assessments, provided that the grant goes directly to the State pipeline agency as required under current law. OPS informed the Committee that there are at least 10 States that could use these funds to conduct risk assessments.

The Committee directs that RSPA submit a letter to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before April l, 1996, indicating on a State-by-State basis, the extent to which States are using existing information resources and expertise to allocate inspection resources primarily on a risk basis. The Committee expects that RSPA will encourage the States to focus on specific areas where the consequences of a pipeline spill would have the most adverse impact on the either the environment, drinking water, or densely populated centers.

The Committee's recommendation includes $1,500,000 for the establishment and development of one-call notification systems. These funds will be used for a diversity of purposes including enacting, enhancing, or implementing one call legislation or regulations, encouraging damage prevention programs and associated mapping and enforcement activities. These funds are provided because one call systems are the best means of reducing third party damage to pipelines. Pipeline release reports submitted to DOT from operators indicate that third party damage or damage caused by outside forces is the number one cause of all pipeline releases. The Committee has increased the amount set aside for one call systems because these systems offer tremendous promise to prevent pipeline incidents and because the demand for this set aside in fiscal year 1995 was substantially over the amount made available.

OPS indicates that there are substantial opportunities to improve State one call systems. OPS asserts that only five States have a timely one-call enforcement program, about 17 States still do not have mandatory membership by all underground facility operators, and only 23 States have emergency service available on a 24-hour basis. The funds provided herein will be used to address these concerns. RSPA stated that the funds previously spent on one

call damage prevention programs have resulted in a lowering of excavation-related failures in some pipelines.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS

(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

Appropriations, 1995	$400,000
(Limitation)	10,800,000
Budget estimate, 1996	400,000
(Limitation)	11,338,000
House allowance	400,000
(Limitation)	8,890,000
Committee recommendation	400,000
(Limitation)	9,200,000

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS

LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS

The Committee recommends a total of $9,200,000 to be appropriated from the hazardous materials shipper and carrier registration fee fund. In addition to the amount provided, $400,000 is directly appropriated for the training curriculum activities authorized under existing law. The remaining funds are allocated under a fiscal year 1996 funding limitation to be distributed as follows:

	Fiscal year 1995 enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Grants	$9,650,000	$9,738,000	$7,350,000	$7,650,000
Technical assistance	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Administrative costs	500,000	500,000	440,000	450,000
Emergency response guidebook	.....	700,000	700,000	700,000
Supplemental training grants	250,000	.....	.....	.....
Total	10,800,000	11,338,000	8,890,000	9,200,000

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$39,891,200
Budget estimate, 1996	40,238,000
House allowance	40,238,000
Committee recommendation	39,891,200

The Office of Inspector General [OIG] was created by the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–452). It is intended to be an independent and objective organization with the explicit mission of: (1) Promoting organizational efficiency and effectiveness; (2) preventing and detecting fraud and abuse; and (3) providing a means of keeping the Secretary of Transportation and Congress fully and currently informed of problems and deficiencies in the administration of departmental programs and operations.

The headquarters audit operation is composed of the Office of Transportation Program Audits and the Office of Information Technology, Secretarial, and Financial Audits. Field offices are located in Baltimore and 7 of 10 standard Federal regions. There are also six regional investigative offices which are responsible for all investigations within their designated areas and two regional inspec-

tions and evaluations offices. Funds are included to implement the provisions of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990.

The Committee recommends $39,891,200 which is $346,800 below the budget request. The Committee has reduced the budget request by holding funding to the fiscal year 1995 level.

BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	$2,322,000
(By transfer)	(20,000,000)
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	2,200,000
(By transfer)	(20,000,000)

The Aviation Statistics Program is proposed for transfer from the Research and Special Programs Administration to this new account. The rationale for this transfer is to put the responsibility for the compilation and analysis of airline economic data with the office that has broad authority to collect and analyze transportation statistics across a wide spectrum. Airline data is a significant component in DOT's intermodal data banks because most interstate and international commercial passengers travel by air. This program includes a small field office located in Anchorage, AK, which provides consumers with reliable and timely airline data related to essential air service and intra-Alaskan mail rate programs. Twenty FTE's and $2,322,000 are requested in support of this program. For fiscal year 1995, the program resources will be transferred by a memorandum of agreement [MOU] signed by RSPA and BTS.

The Committee has included a general fund appropriation of $2,200,000 for the Aviation Statistics Office transfer.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$3,350,000
Budget estimate, 1996	3,656,000
House allowance	3,656,000
Committee recommendation	3,500,000

The Committee recommends $3,500,000 for the operations of the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, a decrease of $156,000 below the budget estimate and the House allowance.

The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (the Access Board) is the lead Federal Agency promoting accessibility for all handicapped persons. The Access Board was reauthorized through fiscal year 1997 in the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1992, Public Law 102–569. Under this authorization, the Access Board's functions are to ensure compliance with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, and to develop guidelines for and technical assistance to individuals and entities with rights or duties under titles II and III of the Americans With Disabilities Act. The Access Board establishes minimum accessibility guidelines and requirements for public accommodations and commercial facilities, transit facilities and vehicles, State and local government facilities, children's environments, and recreational facilities. The Access Board also provides technical assistance to Government agencies, public and private organizations, individuals, and businesses on the removal of accessibility barriers.

The Committee recommended level, $3,500,000, is sufficient to fully fund all the Access Board's statutory responsibilities and to implement planned fiscal year 1996 activities, including accessibility guideline development and publication, research, public communications outreach, and training programs.

The decrease below the requested amount reflects the Committee's determination that the projected cost savings associated with the purchase, installation, and operation of the Department of Treasury's Glows financial accounting system do not justify the approximately $150,000 one-time expenditure. The Access Board estimates that the fiscal year 1996 costs for the Glows system are $80,000 for installation of the system and a 6-month staff training period, $70,000 for purchase of the system's software, and an unspecified amount to purchase two computers to run the Glows system. In response to Committee questioning, the Access Board testified that, if it purchases the Glows system, it will no longer use the financial, accounting, and budget services provided by the General Services Administration, saving the Access Board about $20,000 a

year. However, the Access Board will pay $10,000 a year to the Department of Treasury for service and support to the Glows system, and if additional services are required, reimbursement to Treasury will be necessary on an ad hoc basis. Thus, the anticipated savings to the Access Board are insufficient to justify this level of investment at the present time.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$37,392,000
Budget estimate, 1996	38,774,000
House allowance	38,774,000
Committee recommendation	37,500,000

The Independent Safety Board Act of 1974 established the National Transportation Safety Board [NTSB] as an independent Federal agency to promote transportation safety by conducting independent accident investigations. In addition, the Act authorizes the Board to make safety recommendations, conduct safety studies, and oversee safety activities of other Government agencies involved in transportation. The Board also reviews appeals of adverse actions by the Department of Transportation with respect to airmen and seamen certificates and licenses.

The Board has no regulatory authority over the transportation industry. Thus, its effectiveness depends on its reputation for impartial and accurate accident reports, realistic and feasible safety recommendations, and on public confidence in its commitment to improving transportation safety.

The bill includes an appropriation of $37,500,000, which is $108,000 above the fiscal year 1995 level. Due to fiscal constraints, this funding is $1,274,000 below the administration's budget request. The amount recommended provides for a full-time equivalent [FTE] employment level of 350. The following table incorporates the NTSB's internal realignment of administrative functions and provides for salaries and expenses to be distributed as follows:

	Staff (FTE)	Budget authority
Policy and direction	45	$5,459,000
Aviation safety	122	12,895,000
Surface transportation safety	94	10,139,000
Research and engineering	48	5,126,000
Administration	31	2,596,000
Administrative law judges	10	1,285,000
Total	350	37,500,000

The Committee agrees with the House expectation that it be advised in cases where the Board plans to deviate in any way from its total FTE allocations or by more than 10 percent from the funding allocations listed above.

EMERGENCY FUND

Appropriations, 1995	.....
Budget estimate, 1996	$360,802
House allocation	160,802
Committee recommendation	360,802

The Committee recommendation of $360,802 for the emergency fund is $200,000 more than the House allowance and the same as the budget request. This brings the total available in the National Transportation Safety Board's emergency fund to $1,000,000, the amount specified when the fund was created in Public Law 97–267. This fund is used for extraordinary accident investigation expenses, when those investigations would otherwise be impeded by lack of funds.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$30,302,000
Budget estimate, 1996	28,884,000
House allowance	13,379,000
Committee recommendation	13,379,000

[1] The appropriation for the Office of the Secretary includes $4,705,000 for the ICC sunset.

The Interstate Commerce Commission [ICC] is an independent agency created by Congress in 1887 to regulate interstate transportation.

The Committee intends to implement the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution assumption which would terminate the Interstate Commerce Commission. Deleting this agency will eliminate counterproductive and outdated economic regulation of the railroad industry. The motor carrier industry has already been relieved of unnecessary Government economic regulation under the Trucking Interstate Regulatory Reform Act of 1994. The Committee notes with approval that the administration finally has echoed congressional leadership regarding the sunset of the ICC, the oldest independent Federal regulatory agency.

The House has appropriated $13,379,000 for the ICC and included another $8,421,000 in a general provision (sec. 342), for a total of $21,800,000. The House would provide $8,395,000 for first-quarter ICC salaries and expenses; $4,984,000 in severance and closedown costs; and $8,421,000 in user fees to cover other ICC expenses. The Committee notes that the Senate authorizing committee has not yet reported any ICC termination legislation to address which ICC functions will sunset and which will continue at DOT, as well as how they will be organized. In view of the fact that Congress appropriated $30,302,000 in fiscal year 1995 to operate a fully functioning ICC; this Committee firmly believes that $21,800,000 is an excessive sum to close down this agency.

The bill as reported by the Committee has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office with $13,379,000 in costs associated with the termination of this agency.

The Committee has separately appropriated $4,705,000, as requested by the administration, for the Department of Transportation to assume any necessary functions of the ICC. These funds

are included within the Office of the Secretary, under the head "ICC Sunset."

PAYMENTS FOR DIRECTED RAIL SERVICE

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Limitation, 1995	($475,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(475,000)
House allowance	(475,000)
Committee recommendation	(475,000)

Under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 11125, when a rail carrier is in such financial trouble that it becomes impossible to continue its operations, the Commission is empowered to direct and pay another carrier to move that carrier's traffic for a period of up to 60 days, which can be extended for an additional 180 days if cause exists. In certain cases, the Commission's use of this authority has not resulted in any cost to the Federal Government. However, there have been several instances where the use of this authority has resulted in a liability for payment to an operating carrier by the Federal Government.

The Committee provides an obligation limitation of $475,000 for fiscal year 1996, even though no additional directed rail service is anticipated. In the event that such authority needs to be exercised by the Commission, proper and timely notification to Congress is required. The limitation is the same as the House allowance.

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

The Panama Canal Commission is an agency of the executive branch of the U.S. Government established by the Panama Canal Act of 1979 (93 Stat. 452; 22 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), to carry out the responsibilities of the United States under the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977. The authority of the President of the United States with respect to the Commission is exercised through the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army. The Commission is supervised by a nine-member Board; five members are nationals of the United States and four are Panamanians. Board members who are U.S. nationals are appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Under the terms of the treaty, the Commission manages, operates, and maintains the Canal, its complementary works, installations, and equipment, and provides for the orderly transit of vessels through the Canal. The Commission will perform these functions until the treaty terminates on December 31, 1999, when the Republic of Panama will assume full responsibility for the Canal.

PANAMA CANAL REVOLVING FUND

(ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND LIMITATION ON OPERATING AND CAPITAL EXPENSES)

	Administrative expenses	Limitation on operating/capital
Appropriations, 1995	($50,030,000)	($540,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1996	(50,741,000)	.....
House allowance	(50,741,000)	.....
Committee recommendation	(50,741,000)	.....

Administrative expenses.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $50,741,000, the same as the budget request and the House allowance. This account encompasses the following activities: executive direction, operations, financial management, personnel administration, and employment costs of a general nature which are not identifiable with other specific activities. Included in the latter activity are such items as reimbursement to the Department of Defense for education and hospital services and the Commission's share of employee health insurance premiums.

Operating and capital expenses.—The Panama Canal Commission is a business enterprise which, by law, must operate at no cost to the U.S. taxpayers. Toll revenues collected from vessels transiting the Panama Canal and revenues from other services are deposited into the Panama Canal revolving fund, from which the Commission obtains its operating and capital funds. The Committee concurs with the House action deleting language limiting obligations for nonadministrative operating expenses and capital projects. This is consistent with the administration's budget request, and will obviate the future need for the Commission to use emergency authority to access internally generated operating expense funds or to request supplemental funds above an artificial limitation on obligations.

As outlined in the bill, a limitation of $46,000 is provided for official reception and representation expenses, of which (1) not more than $11,000 may be available to the Supervisory Board of the Commission; (2) not more than $5,000 may be available for such expenses of the Secretary of the Commission; and (3) not more than $30,000 may be available to the Administrator of the Commission.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

INTEREST PAYMENTS

Appropriations, 1995	$664,666,667
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

Early repayment of Federal share of interest payments.—Through 1994, this account provided the annual Federal share (two-thirds) of interest payments on outstanding WMATA bonds sold in support of the rail construction program. The WMATA bonds, which totaled $997,000,000, were guaranteed by the Federal Government and were to become due beginning in the year 2012. In December 1993, the WMATA bonds were refinanced in order to take advantage of

lower interest rates. As part of this refinancing, the Department of Transportation borrowed $665,000,000 from the Federal Financing Bank [FFB] to pay off the Federal two-thirds share of the original bonds.

In 1995, $665,000,000 was appropriated to repay the principal owed by the Department of Transportation to the FFB. No funds are, therefore, necessary for this payment.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee concurs with the general provisions that apply to the Department and agencies funded through this legislation in fiscal year 1996 as approved by the House in H.R. 2002, with the following deletions or changes. Other changes are explained under the account or agency affected by the general provision.

CHANGES, DELETIONS/REPLACEMENTS, NEW SECTIONS

SEC. 303. Technical change to include a reference to more recently enacted legislation.

SEC. 311. Limits political appointees to 100 rather than the 110 cited in the House bill.

SEC. 313. Deletes the House provision which prohibits the use of funds for a safety advisory committee.

SEC. 327. Reduces the Department's working capital fund by $5,000,000 rather than the $10,000,000 proposed by the House.

SEC. 330. Deletes the House provision which prohibits the use of funds to prepare, propose, or promulgate any rule under title V of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act which prescribes corporate average fuel economy standards for motor vehicles.

SEC. 335. Deletes the prohibition against including the Maritime Administration when the $25,000,000 reduction for personnel compensation and benefits associated with streamlining and consolidation is applied. In addition, the Committee directs the President to submit a DOT reorganization plan to Congress when transmitting the budget request for fiscal year 1997.

SEC. 336. Broadens the authority of the Secretary to transfer funds to meet shortfalls in the "Rental payments" account.

SEC. 337. Deletes the House prohibition against certain types of training. The Committee substitute allows only training that is consistent with existing law (5 U.S.C. 4014).

SEC. 338. Deletes the House provision which allows the Hot Springs, AR, airport to operate without regard to rent diversion and rent maximization laws.

SEC. 339. Adds new subsection (c) which defines that time spent on workers' compensation rolls should be counted as regular employment time.

SEC. 340. Deletes House provision which prohibits the use of funds to train citizens of the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 341. Deletes House provision which requires FTA oversight of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to be based in Washington, DC.

SEC. 342. Deletes House provision which provides funding for the successor of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Committee has provided these funds under the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 343. Adds a new provision that allows the State of Louisiana to transfer previously provided contract authority from one project to another project within the State.

SEC. 344. Adds a provision clarifying the status of an interstate maintenance project and a Federal lands project funded with discretionary funds.

SEC. 345. Directs the Secretary of DOT, in concert with the Secretary of Labor and the Administrator of EPA, to prepare a report on telecommuting.

SEC. 346. Exempts the Indian Reservation roads program from reduction in authorizations otherwise required by section 1003(c) of Public Law 102–240.

SEC. 347. Allows a State, at its option, to trade in unobligated highway contract authority for new fiscal year 1996 contract authority that would otherwise be rescinded due to section 1003(c) of Public Law 102–240.

SEC. 348. Allows a State, at its option, to trade in unobligated highway demonstration project funds, either contract authority or appropriations, to receive new authority for fiscal year 1996.

SEC. 349. Adds a new section to chapter 3 of title 49 of the United States Code which establishes interstate compact infrastructure banks.

SEC. 350. Directs the Secretary of Transportation to develop and implement a new personnel management system for the Federal Aviation Administration.

SEC. 351. Directs the Secretary of Transportation to develop and implement a new acquisition management system for the Federal Aviation Administration.

SEC. 352. Technical amendment that clarifies the Secretary of DOT's authority to cancel any part of a PFC except that portion necessary to make payments for due debt service.

SEC. 353. Reduces the amount of funding allowed for bonuses and cash awards to $25,875,075.

SEC. 354. Limits the amount of funding for expenses of advisory committees to $850,000.

SEC. 355. Enables the Secretary of Transportation to enforce and continue in effect the exemption provisions of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act.

SEC. 356. Names the FAA Technical Center at the Atlantic City International Airport the William J. Hughes Technical Center.

SEC. 357. Prohibits outright closure of Coast Guard small boat stations, but does allow the Secretary to implement management efficiencies.

SEC. 358. Allows the State of Louisiana to transfer highway funds from one project to another within the State.

SEC. 359. Amends Public Law 97–268 to transfer a small parcel of Federal property to the city of Hoboken, NJ. This public law, as enacted in 1982, provided for the transfer of a much larger section of property to the city of Hoboken but exempted this smaller parcel from transfer because of an existing Federal need. This Federal need has terminated.

TITLE IV

SECS. 401–405. Deletes all of title IV, known as the National Capital Area Interest Arbitration Standards Act of 1995. This section provides for the adoption of mandatory standards and procedures governing arbitrators and arbitration of labor disputes in the National Capital area (Washington, DC).

TITLE V

SEC. 501. Deletes House provision restricting the use of funds for the Miller Highway in New York City, NY.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

Office of the Secretary:	
ICC Sunset	$4,705,000
State infrastructure banks	250,000,000
Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses	2,286,000,000
Acquisition, construction and improvements	366,800,000
Environmental compliance and restoration	21,000,000
Port safety development	15,000,000
Research, development, testing and evaluation	20,000,000
Federal Aviation Administration: Office of commercial space	5,770,000
Federal Highway Administration:	
State Route 2, West Virginia	9,050,000
6th/7th St., Brownsville, TX	500,000
Des Moines to Ottumwa, IA	6,450,000
I–70/610 Interchange, Louisiana	5,000,000
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: Motor vehicle safety	121,605,000
Federal Railroad Administration:	
Alaska Railroad	10,000,000
Rhode Island Railroad	2,000,000
Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	605,000,000
Northeast corridor improvement project	130,000,000
Research and Special Programs Administration:	
Gas pipeline safety program and hazardous liquid pipeline safety program	18,275,000
Pipeline safety grants	12,000,000

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the accompanying bill was ordered reported from the Committee, subject to amendment and subject to the subcommittee allocation, by recorded vote of 28–0, a quorum being present.

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Hatfield	
Mr. Stevens	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Gramm	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. Gorton	
Mr. McConnell	

Mr. Mack
Mr. Burns
Mr. Shelby
Mr. Jeffords
Mr. Gregg
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Byrd
Mr. Inouye
Mr. Hollings
Mr. Johnston
Mr. Leahy
Mr. Bumpers
Mr. Lautenberg
Mr. Harkin
Ms. Mikulski
Mr. Reid
Mr. Kerrey
Mr. Kohl
Mrs. Murray

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

In compliance with this rule, the following changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italic; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

Section 201 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 181) is amended by adding at the end the following:

> *"As used in this title, the term 'foreign commerce' includes flight operations (excluding ground operations performed by persons other than flight crew members) conducted in whole or in part outside the United States (as defined by section 40102(a)(41) of title 49, United States Code) by an air carrier (as defined by section 40102(a)(2) of such title).".*

EMPLOYEE

> *Section 202 of such Act (45 U.S.C. 182) is amended by adding at the end the following: "As used in this title, the term 'employee' also includes flight crew members employed by an air carrier (as defined by section 40102(a)(2) of title 49, United States Code) while such flight crew members*

perform work in whole or in part outside the United States (as defined by section 40102(a)(41) of such title).''.

Chapter 3 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by the addition of the following new section:

''SEC. 334. INTERSTATE COMPACT INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS.—(a) CONSENT TO INTERSTATE COMPACTS.—In order to increase public investment, attract needed private investment, and promote an intermodal transportation network, Congress grants consent to the States to enter into interstate compacts establishing transportation infrastructure banks to promote regional or multi-State investment in transportation infrastructure and thereby improve economic productivity.

''(b) ASSISTANCE FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES.—An Interstate Compact Transportation Infrastructure Bank (Infrastructure Bank) established under this section may make loans, issue debt under the authority of the Infrastructure Bank's State jurisdictions either jointly or separately as the Infrastructure Bank and its jurisdictions determine, and provide other assistance to public or private entities constructing, or proposing to construct or initiate, transportation projects, programs, or activities that are eligible to receive financial assistance under—

''(1) title 23, United States Code, and the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991; and

''(2) chapters 53 and 221 and subtitle VII, part B, of this title.

''(c) FORMS OF ASSISTANCE.—An Infrastructure Bank may loan or provide other assistance to a public or private entity in an amount equal to all or part of the cost of construction or capital cost of a qualifying project. The amount of any loan or other assistance received for a qualifying project under this section may be subordinated to any other debt financing for the project. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'other assistance' includes any use of funds for the purpose of credit enhancements, use as a capital reserve for bond or debt instrument financing, bond or debt instrument financing issuance costs, bond or debt issuance financing insurance, subsidizing of interest rates, letters of credit, credit instruments, bond or debt financing instrument security, other forms of debt financing that relate to the qualifying project, and other leveraging tools approved by the Secretary.

''(d) INTERSTATE COMPACT TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE BANK REQUIREMENTS.—In order to qualify an Interstate Compact Transportation Infrastructure Bank for capitalization grants under this section, each participating State shall—

''(1) deposit into the Infrastructure Bank, from non-Federal or Federal sources other than this title or title 23, United States Code, an amount equal to 25 percent of each capitalization grant or, if lower because of the

proportion of Federal lands in the State, the proportional non-Federal share that a State would otherwise pay on the basis of section 120(b) of title 23;

"(2) ensure that the Infrastructure Bank maintains on a continuing basis an investment grade rating on its debt issuances or has a sufficient level of bond or debt financing instrument insurance to maintain the viability of the fund;

"(3) ensure that investment income generated by the funds deposited into an Infrastructure Bank shall be—

"(A) credited to the Infrastructure Bank;

"(B) available for use in providing loans and other assistance to qualifying projects, programs, or activities from the Infrastructure Bank; and

"(C) invested in U.S. Treasury securities, bank deposits, or such other financing instruments as the Secretary may provide to earn interest to enhance the leveraging of qualifying transportation activities;

"(4) provide that the repayment of a loan or other assistance to a State from any loan under this section may be credited to the Infrastructure Bank or obligated for any purpose for which the loaned funds were available under this title or title 23;

"(5) ensure that any loan from an Infrastructure Bank shall bear any positive interest the Bank determines appropriate to make the qualifying project feasible;

"(6) ensure that repayment of any loan from an Infrastructure Bank shall commence not later than five years after the facility has opened to traffic or the project, activity or facility has been completed;

"(7) ensure that the term for repaying any loan shall not exceed 30 years from the date of obligation of the loan;

"(8) limit any assignment, transfer, or loan to an Infrastructure Bank to not more than the amount which a State is entitled to under subsection (f) of this section; and

"(9) require the Infrastructure Bank to make an annual report to the Secretary on its status no later than September 30 of each year.

"(e) SECRETARIAL REQUIREMENTS.—In administering this section, the Secretary shall—

"(1) ensure that federal disbursements for capital reserves shall be at a rate consistent with historic rates for the Federal-aid highway program; and

"(2) specify procedures and guidelines for establishing, operating, and making loans from an Infrastructure Bank.

"(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; CONTRIBUTIONS FROM TITLE 23 APPORTIONMENTS.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund established under section 9502 of the Internal Reve-

nue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9502) to carry out this section not more than $250,000,000 in Fiscal Year 1996.

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of title 23, United States Code, and Public Law 102–240 (Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991), a State may contribute to an Infrastructure Bank up to —— percent of federal funds apportioned under section 104———— of title 23 that are subject to the annual Federal-aid Highways obligation limitation.

"(3) A state may disburse funds appropriated under paragraph (f)(1) of this subsection or contributed under (f)(2) of this subsection to an Infrastructure Bank at a rate that does not exceed the traditional rate of disbursement for the Airport Improvement Program or the Federal-aid Highway program, respectively.

"(g) STATE ALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall apportion to the chief executive of each State choosing to participate in an Infrastructure Bank the percentage allocation of the amount available under paragraph (e)(1) of this section on the first day of the fiscal year, as follows:

"State	*Percentage*
"Alabama	*1.26*
"Alaska	*5.64*
"Arizona	*2.20*
"Arkansas	*0.74*
"California	*8.57*
"Colorado	*2.31*
"Connecticut	*0.74*
"Delaware	*0.04*
"District of Columbia	*0.01*
"Florida	*6.49*
"Georgia	*3.08*
"Hawaii	*2.54*
"Idaho	*0.75*
"Illinois	*3.92*
"Indiana	*1.46*
"Iowa	*0.95*
"Kansas	*0.68*
"Kentucky	*1.80*
"Louisiana	*1.34*
"Maine	*0.66*
"Maryland	*0.84*
"Massachusetts	*1.72*
"Michigan	*2.68*
"Minnesota	*1.59*
"Mississippi	*0.76*
"Missouri	*1.92*
"Montana	*1.10*
"Nebraska	*0.87*
"Nevada	*1.46*
"New Hampshire	*0.28*
"New Jersey	*1.16*
"New Mexico	*0.98*
"New York	*5.82*
"North Carolina	*2.92*
"North Dakota	*0.61*
"Ohio	*2.32*
"Oklahoma	*0.97*
"Oregon	*1.15*
"Pennsylvania	*3.29*
"Rhode Island	*0.39*
"South Carolina	*1.05*

"South Dakota	*0.55*
"Tennessee	*2.13*
"Texas	*7.64*
"Utah	*1.04*
"Vermont	*0.22*
"Virginia	*2.91*
"Washington	*1.78*
"West Virginia	*0.58*
"Wisconsin	*1.41*
"Wyoming	*0.74*
"Puerto Rico	*0.99*

"(g) UNITED STATES NOT OBLIGATED.—The deposit of Federal apportionments into an Infrastructure Bank shall not be construed as a commitment, guarantee, or obligation on the part of the United States to any third party, nor shall any third party have any right against the United States for payment solely by virtue of the deposit. Furthermore, any security or debt financing instrument issued by an Infrastructure Bank shall expressly state that the security or instrument does not constitute a commitment, guarantee, or obligation of the United States.

"(h) MANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—Sections 3335 and 6503 of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply to funds used as a capital reserve under this section.

"(i) PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.—For each fiscal year, a State may contribute to an Infrastructure Bank an amount not to exceed two percent of the Federal funds deposited into that Infrastructure Bank by the State to provide for the reasonable costs of administering the fund.".

(b) RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION.—Of the available contract authority balances under the account entitled "Grants-In-Aid for Airports" in this Act, $250,000,000 are rescinded.

Section 40117(c) of title 49, United States Code is amended by adding a new paragraph that allows for an increase of airport passenger facility charges.

SEC. 352. PASSENGER FACILITY FEES.—(a) Section 40117(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)";

(b) Section 40117(b)(3) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(4)";

(c) Section 40117(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding a new paragraph (2) as follows:

"(2) Provided that an eligible agency with authority to impose a passenger facility fee submits to the Secretary and all relevant air carriers a written notice of its intention to adjust its passenger facility fee in accordance with paragraphs (A) and (B) below no less than 120 days before the effective date of such an increase, the eligible agency may, subject to regulations the Secretary shall prescribe:

"(A) increase the passenger facility fee it has the authority to impose pursuant to its approved application by no more than $2.00 for the purpose of fi-

nancing an eligible airport-related project covered under this section, including any such project identified in the agency's approved application; and/or

"(B) adjust, on an annual basis, the amount of the passenger facility fee indicated in the agency's approved application and any adjustment to the fee made in accordance with paragraph (A) above by the Consumer Price Index for each respective year to finance any increase in the costs of constructing an eligible airport-related project covered under this section, including any increase in the costs of constructing any such project identified in the agency's approved application;

"(C) if the Secretary determines, before the effective date of a passenger facility fee adjustment pursuant to paragraphs (A) or (B) above, that the passenger facility revenues derived from such an adjustment are to finance a project not covered within the meaning of this section, the Secretary shall notify the agency that it is prohibited from effectuating, either in whole or part, any such adjustment."

Federal aviation law regarding passenger facility charges, section 40117 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence in paragraph (2) and inserting new text.

(2) The Secretary periodically shall audit and review the use by an eligible agency of passenger facility revenue. [After review and a public hearing, the Secretary may end any part of the authority of the agency to impose a passenger facility fee to the extent the Secretary decides that the revenue is not being used as provided in this section.] *After review and a public hearing, the Secretary may end any part of the authority of the agency to impose a passenger facility fee, except for that portion necessary to make payments for debt service due by the agency on indebtedness incurred to carry out an eligible airport-related project.*

Public Law 97–268 is amended to transfer a small parcel of Federal property to the city of Hoboken, NJ. This public law, as enacted in 1982, provided for the transfer of a much larger section of property to the city of Hoboken but exempted this smaller parcel from transfer because of an existing Federal need. This Federal need has terminated.

(a) the property transferred to the Department of the Treasury by the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1929, *and*

(b) the property excluded by the second paragraph of section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 [Stat. 220), and

(c) the property beginning at a point in the easterly line of River Street, distant 10 feet southerly from the intersection formed by the northerly line of Second Street, extended with the easterly line of River Street, running

thence; north 13 degrees 04 minutes east and along the easterly line of River Street, a distance of 250.20 feet to a point, thence south 76 degrees 56 minutes east a distance of 108 feet to a point, thence south 13 degrees 04 minutes west and parallel to River Street a distance of 154.62 feet to a point of curvature, thence on a curve to the right having a radius of 256 feet and an arc distance of 97.95 feet to a point, then north 76 degrees 56 minutes west and parallel to the second course a distance of 89.49 feet to a point in the easterly line of River Street, said point being the point or place of beginning. Said parcel lying in a city block 231 and being a part of lot 3 as shown on the official assessment map of the city of Hoboken, Hudson County, New Jersey, concurrent with] *Stat. 220); concurrent with* a transfer of title to said real property, the city of Hoboken, New Jersey shall agree to assume sole responsibility with respect to said property and to indemnify and hold harmless the United States against any obligation, past, present, or future, with respect to said property.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93–344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1996: Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies:				
Defense discretionary	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nondefense discretionary	12,400	12,399	36,561	[1] 36,561
Violent crime reduction fund	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mandatory	584	582	581	[1] 581
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
1996	.....	.....	.....	[2] 11,706
1997	.....	.....	.....	13,606
1998	.....	.....	.....	5,312
1999	.....	.....	.....	2,211
2000 and future year	.....	.....	.....	2,100
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1996 in bill	NA	1,299	NA	3,536

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Item	1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION							
Office of the Secretary							
Salaries and expenses	$58,094,000	$57,459,000	$55,011,500	$56,500,000	−$1,594,000	−$959,000	+$1,488,500
Immediate Office of the Secretary	(1,220,000)				(−1,220,000)		
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	(583,000)				(−583,000)		
Office of the General Counsel	(7,876,000)				(−7,876,000)		
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy	(2,309,000)				(−2,309,000)		
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs	(7,887,000)				(−7,887,000)		
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	(4,400,000)				(−4,400,000)		
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	(2,250,000)				(−2,250,000)		
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	(22,425,000)				(−22,425,000)		
Office of Public Affairs	(1,380,000)				(−1,380,000)		
Executive Secretariat	(932,000)				(−932,000)		
Contract Appeals Board	(630,000)				(−630,000)		
Office of Civil Rights	(1,779,000)				(−1,779,000)		
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	(936,000)				(−936,000)		
Minority Business Resource Center	(4,000,000)				(−4,000,000)		
Office of Intelligence and Security	(800,000)				(−800,000)		
Office of Intermodalism	(1,000,000)				(−1,000,000)		
Undistributed	(−2,313,000)				(+2,313,000)		
Office of Civil Rights		12,793,000	6,554,000	12,083,000	+12,083,000	−710,000	+5,529,000
Transportation planning, research, and development	8,293,000	15,710,000	3,309,000	9,710,000	+1,417,000	−6,000,000	+6,401,000
Office of Commercial Space Transportation: Operations and Research	6,060,000				−6,060,000		
Working capital fund	(93,000,000)	(104,364,000)	(102,231,000)	(104,364,000)	(+11,364,000)		(+2,133,000)

Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):							
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(33,423,000)	.....	(15,000,000)	(26,738,536)	(−6,684,464)	(+26,738,536)	(+11,738,536)
(Limitation on obligations)	(33,423,000)	.....	(15,000,000)	(26,738,536)	(−6,684,464)	(+26,738,536)	(+11,738,536)
Rescission of contract authority	(−4,000,000)	(−38,600,000)	(−23,600,000)	(−11,861,464)	(−7,861,464)	(+26,738,536)	(+11,738,536)
Rescission	.....	(−6,786,971)	(−6,786,971)	(−6,786,971)	(−6,786,971)	.....	.....
Rental payments	144,419,000	143,436,000	130,803,000	139,689,000	−4,730,000	−3,747,000	+8,886,000
Headquarters facilities	.....	331,000,000	.....	.....	.....	−331,000,000	.....
Minority business resource center program	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	.....	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	.....	.....	.....
Minority business outreach	.....	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,100,000	+2,100,000	−800,000	−800,000
ICC Sunset	.....	4,705,000	.....	4,705,000	+4,705,000	.....	+4,705,000
State Infrastructure Banks	.....	.....	.....	250,000,000	+250,000,000	+250,000,000	+250,000,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	218,766,000	569,903,000	200,477,500	476,687,000	+257,921,000	−93,216,000	+276,209,500
(Limitations on obligations)	(33,423,000)	.....	(15,000,000)	(26,738,536)	(−6,684,464)	(+26,738,536)	(+11,738,536)
Total budgetary resources	(252,189,000)	(569,903,000)	(215,477,500)	(503,425,536)	(+251,236,536)	(−66,477,464)	(+287,948,036)
Coast Guard							
Operating expenses	2,598,000,000	2,618,316,000	2,565,607,000	2,286,000,000	−312,000,000	−332,316,000	−279,607,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:							
Vessels	187,900,000	203,700,000	191,200,000	178,000,000	−9,900,000	−25,700,000	−13,200,000
Aircraft	11,800,000	19,500,000	16,500,000	14,500,000	+2,700,000	−5,000,000	−2,000,000
Other equipment	29,700,000	56,300,000	42,200,000	47,600,000	+17,900,000	−8,700,000	+5,400,000
Shore facilities and aids to navigation	89,350,000	99,800,000	82,275,000	80,200,000	−9,150,000	−19,600,000	−2,075,000
Personnel and related support	44,200,000	48,900,000	43,000,000	46,500,000	+2,300,000	−2,400,000	+3,500,000
Subtotal, AC&I	362,950,000	428,200,000	375,175,000	366,800,000	+3,850,000	−61,400,000	−8,375,000
Environmental compliance and restoration	23,500,000	25,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	−2,500,000	−4,000,000	.....
Port Safety Development	.....	.....	.....	15,000,000	+15,000,000	+15,000,000	+15,000,000
Alteration of bridges	.....	2,000,000	16,000,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000	.....	−14,000,000
Retired pay	562,585,000	582,022,000	582,022,000	582,022,000	+19,437,000	.....	.....
Reserve training	64,981,000	64,859,000	61,859,000	62,000,000	−2,981,000	−2,859,000	+141,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation	20,310,000	22,500,000	18,500,000	20,000,000	−310,000	−2,500,000	+1,500,000
Boat safety (Aquatic Resources Trust Fund)	25,000,000	.....	20,000,000	.....	−25,000,000	.....	−20,000,000
Emergency Fund (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund) (limitation of permanent appropriation)	.....	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	(−3,000,000)
Total, Coast Guard	3,657,326,000	3,742,897,000	3,660,163,000	3,354,822,000	−302,504,000	−388,075,000	−305,341,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—Continued

Item	1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Federal Aviation Administration							
Operations	4,595,394,000	4,704,000,000	4,600,000,000	4,550,000,000	−45,394,000	−154,000,000	−50,000,000
Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	2,087,489,000	1,917,847,000	2,000,000,000	1,890,377,000	−197,112,000	−27,470,000	−109,623,000
Rescission	(−35,000,000)	.....	(−60,000,000)	(−70,000,000)	(−35,000,000)	(−70,000,000)	(−10,000,000)
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	259,192,000	267,661,000	143,000,000	215,886,000	−43,306,000	−51,775,000	+72,886,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):							
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	.....	.....	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(1,450,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,600,000,000)	(1,250,000,000)	(−200,000,000)	(−250,000,000)	(−350,000,000)
Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	.....	−255,000,000	−255,000,000	−255,000,000	−255,000,000
Aircraft purchase loan guarantee program	148,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	−98,000	.....	.....
(Limitation on borrowing authority)	(9,970,000)	(1,600,000)	(1,600,000)	(1,600,000)	(−8,370,000)	.....	.....
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	6,942,223,000	6,889,558,000	6,743,050,000	6,656,313,000	−285,910,000	−233,245,000	−86,737,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(1,450,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,600,000,000)	(1,250,000,000)	(−200,000,000)	(−250,000,000)	(−350,000,000)
Total budgetary resources	(8,392,223,000)	(8,389,558,000)	(8,343,050,000)	(7,906,313,000)	(−485,910,000)	(−483,245,000)	(−436,737,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure investment program (limitation on obligations)	.....	(−1,500,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	(+1,500,000,000)	.....
Total budgetary resources	(8,392,223,000)	(6,889,558,000)	(8,343,050,000)	(7,906,313,000)	(−485,910,000)	(+1,016,755,000)	(−436,737,000)
Federal Highway Administration							
Limitation on general operating expenses	(525,341,000)	(689,486,000)	(495,381,000)	(548,434,000)	(+23,093,000)	(−141,052,000)	(+53,053,000)
Highway-related safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):							
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(10,800,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(+2,200,000)	(+3,000,000)	(+3,000,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,800,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(+2,200,000)	(+3,000,000)	(+3,000,000)
Rescission of contract authority	(−20,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	(+20,000,000)	.....	.....
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):							
(Limitation on obligations)	(17,160,000,000)	(20,254,255,000)	(18,000,000,000)	(17,000,000,000)	(−160,000,000)	(−3,254,255,000)	(−1,000,000,000)

(Exempt obligations)	(2,267,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,932,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,806,000)	(+2,251,507,000)	(+19,575,000)
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(17,000,000,000)	(19,200,000,000)	(19,200,000,000)	(19,200,000,000)	(+2,200,000,000)	.....	.....
Right-of-way revolving fund (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on direct loans)	(42,500,000)	.....	.....	.....	(−42,500,000)	.....	.....
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):							
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(73,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(68,000,000)	(−5,000,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(74,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(79,150,000)	(75,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(−10,000,000)	(−4,150,000)
Surface transportation projects	352,055,000	.....	.....	39,500,000	−312,555,000	+39,500,000	+39,500,000
Rescission	(−12,004,000)	.....	.....	.....	(+12,004,000)	.....	.....
High priority corridor (sec. 314A)	6,000,000	.....	.....	.....	−6,000,000	.....	.....
Orange County, CA toll road project (sec. 336a)	8,000,000	.....	.....	.....	−8,000,000	.....	.....
Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Federal Highway Administration	366,055,000	.....	.....	39,500,000	−326,555,000	+39,500,000	+39,500,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(17,244,800,000)	(20,349,255,000)	(18,089,150,000)	(17,088,000,000)	(−156,800,000)	(−3,261,255,000)	(−1,001,150,000)
(Exempt obligations)	(2,267,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,932,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,806,000)	(+2,251,507,000)	(+19,575,000)
Total budgetary resources	(19,878,556,000)	(20,429,255,000)	(20,401,082,000)	(19,459,007,000)	(−419,549,000)	(−970,248,000)	(−942,075,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure investment program (limitation on obligations)	.....	(−20,134,255,000)	.....	.....	.....	(+20,134,255,000)	.....
Total budgetary resources	(19,878,556,000)	(295,000,000)	(20,401,082,000)	(19,459,007,000)	(−419,549,000)	(+19,164,007,000)	(−942,075,000)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration							
Operations and research	79,556,000	84,598,000	73,316,570	71,261,000	−8,295,000	−13,337,000	−2,055,570
Rescissions	.....	.....	(−4,547,185)	.....	.....	.....	(+4,547,185)
Operations and research (Highway Trust Fund)	46,997,000	59,744,000	52,011,930	50,344,000	+3,347,000	−9,400,000	−1,667,930
Subtotal, Operations and research	126,553,000	144,342,000	125,328,500	121,605,000	−4,948,000	−22,737,000	−3,723,500
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):							
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(151,000,000)	(180,000,000)	(153,400,000)	(155,100,000)	(+4,100,000)	(−24,900,000)	(+1,700,000)
State and community highway safety grants (Sec. 402) (limitation on obligations)	(123,000,000)	(168,600,000)	(126,000,000)	(128,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(−40,600,000)	(+2,000,000)
National Driver Register (Sec. 402) (limitation on obligations)	(3,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,100,000)	(−1,300,000)	(−300,000)	(−300,000)
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures programs (Sec. 410) (limitation on obligations)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	.....	.....	.....
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	126,553,000	144,342,000	125,328,500	121,605,000	−4,948,000	−22,737,000	−3,723,500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—Continued

Item	1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(Limitations on obligations)	(151,400,000)	(196,000,000)	(153,400,000)	(155,100,000)	(+3,700,000)	(−40,900,000)	(+1,700,000)
Total budgetary resources	(277,953,000)	(340,342,000)	(278,728,500)	(276,705,000)	(−1,248,000)	(−63,637,000)	(−2,023,500)
Federal Railroad Administration							
Office of the Administrator	13,090,000	17,370,000	14,000,000	14,018,000	+928,000	−3,352,000	+18,000
Local rail freight assistance	17,000,000				−17,000,000		
Rescission	(−6,563,000)				(+6,563,000)		
Railroad safety	47,729,000	51,104,000	49,940,660	49,105,000	+1,376,000	−1,999,000	−835,660
Railroad research and development	20,500,000	48,947,000	21,000,000	25,775,000	+5,275,000	−23,172,000	+4,775,000
Northeast corridor improvement program	200,000,000	235,000,000	100,000,000	130,000,000	−70,000,000	−105,000,000	+30,000,000
Next generation high speed rail	20,000,000	30,000,000	10,000,000	20,000,000		−10,000,000	+10,000,000
Trust fund share of next generation high speed rail (Highway Trust Fund):							
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(3,400,000)	(7,118,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+1,600,000)	(−2,118,000)	
(Limitation on obligations)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)			
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation				10,000,000	+10,000,000	+10,000,000	+10,000,000
Pennsylvania station redevelopment project	40,000,000	50,000,000		25,000,000	−15,000,000	−25,000,000	+25,000,000
Rescission	(−40,000,000)				(+40,000,000)		
Rhode Island Rail Development	5,000,000	10,000,000		2,000,000	−3,000,000	−8,000,000	+2,000,000
Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation:							
Operations	542,000,000	420,000,000	336,000,000	305,000,000	−237,000,000	−115,000,000	−31,000,000
Transition costs			62,000,000	100,000,000	+100,000,000	+100,000,000	+38,000,000
Capital	230,000,000	230,000,000	230,000,000	200,000,000	−30,000,000	−30,000,000	−30,000,000
Supplemental	21,500,000				−21,500,000		
Long-term restructuring transition		100,000,000				−100,000,000	
Total, Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	793,500,000	750,000,000	628,000,000	605,000,000	−188,500,000	−145,000,000	−23,000,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	1,156,819,000	1,192,421,000	822,940,660	880,898,000	−275,921,000	−311,523,000	+57,957,340
(Limitations on obligations)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)			

Total budgetary resources	(1,161,819,000)	(1,197,421,000)	(827,940,660)	(885,898,000)	(−275,921,000)	(−311,523,000)	(+57,957,340)
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program		−1,045,000,000				+1,045,000,000	
Total budgetary resources	(1,161,819,000)	(152,421,000)	(827,940,660)	(885,898,000)	(−275,921,000)	(+733,477,000)	(+57,957,340)
Federal Transit Administration							
Administrative expenses	43,060,000	44,202,000	39,260,000	42,000,000	−1,060,000	−2,202,000	+2,740,000
Formula grants	640,000,000	1,244,200,000	490,000,000	585,000,000	−55,000,000	−659,200,000	+95,000,000
Operating assistance grants	710,000,000	500,000,000	400,000,000	400,000,000	−310,000,000	−100,000,000	
Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on obligations)	(1,150,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,110,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(−29,150,000)		(+10,850,000)
University transportation centers	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			
Transit planning and research	92,250,000	100,027,000	82,250,000	90,000,000	−2,250,000	−10,027,000	+7,750,000
Metropolitan planning program		(41,512,500)	(39,436,250)	(40,500,000)	(+40,500,000)	(−1,012,500)	(+1,063,750)
Rural transit assistance program		(4,612,500)	(4,381,250)	(4,500,000)	(+4,500,000)	(−112,500)	(+118,750)
Transit cooperative research program		(8,475,000)	(8,051,250)	(8,250,000)	(+8,250,000)	(−225,000)	(+198,750)
National TPR program		(33,952,000)	(19,480,000)	(25,500,000)	(+25,500,000)	(−8,452,000)	(+6,020,000)
State TPR program		(8,475,000)	(8,051,250)	(8,250,000)	(+8,250,000)	(−225,000)	(+198,750)
National transit institute		(3,000,000)	(2,850,000)	(3,000,000)	(+3,000,000)		(+150,000)
Subtotal, Transit planning and research	(92,250,000)	(100,027,000)	(82,250,000)	(90,000,000)	(−2,250,000)	(−10,027,000)	(+7,750,000)
Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,150,000,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(1,120,850,000)	(−29,150,000)		
Discretionary grants		59,944,000				−59,944,000	
Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund) (limitation on obligations):							
Fixed guideway modernization	(725,000,000)	(724,976,000)	(666,000,000)	(666,000,000)	(−59,000,000)	(−58,976,000)	
Bus and bus-related facilities	(353,330,000)	(274,992,000)	(333,000,000)	(333,000,000)	(−20,330,000)	(+58,008,000)	
New starts	(646,670,000)	(724,976,000)	(666,000,000)	(666,000,000)	(+19,330,000)	(−58,976,000)	
Subtotal, Discretionary grants	(1,725,000,000)	(1,724,944,000)	(1,665,000,000)	(1,665,000,000)	(−60,000,000)	(−59,944,000)	
Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(+200,000,000)		(−300,000,000)
Interstate transfer grants—transit	48,030,000				−48,030,000		
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	170,000,000	−30,000,000	−30,000,000	−30,000,000
Violent crime reduction program (Violent Crime Trust Fund)		5,000,000				−5,000,000	
Total, Federal Transit Administration	1,739,340,000	2,159,373,000	1,217,510,000	1,293,000,000	−446,340,000	−866,373,000	+75,490,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(2,875,000,000)	(2,845,794,000)	(2,775,000,000)	(2,785,850,000)	(−89,150,000)	(−59,944,000)	(+10,850,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—Continued

Item	1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Total budgetary resources	(4,614,340,000)	(5,005,167,000)	(3,992,510,000)	(4,078,850,000)	(−535,490,000)	(−926,317,000)	(+86,340,000)
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program		−2,154,373,000				+2,154,373,000	
(Limitation on obligations)		(−2,785,850,000)				(+2,785,850,000)	
Total budgetary resources	(4,614,340,000)	(64,944,000)	(3,992,510,000)	(4,078,850,000)	(−535,490,000)	(+4,013,906,000)	(+86,340,000)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation							
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	10,251,000	10,243,000	10,190,500	10,150,000	−101,000	−93,000	−40,500
Research and Special Programs Administration							
Research and special programs	26,238,000	31,662,000	26,030,000	24,281,000	−1,957,000	−7,381,000	−1,749,000
Hazardous materials safety	(12,897,000)	(12,782,000)	(12,600,000)	(12,987,000)	(+90,000)	(+205,000)	(+387,000)
Aviation information management	(2,453,000)	(2,282,000)	(2,322,000)		(−2,453,000)	(−2,282,000)	(−2,322,000)
Emergency transportation	(1,326,000)	(1,301,000)	(1,086,000)	(962,000)	(−364,000)	(−339,000)	(−124,000)
Research and technology	(2,530,000)	(7,604,000)	(3,209,000)	(3,451,000)	(+921,000)	(−4,153,000)	(+242,000)
Program and administrative support	(7,032,000)	(7,693,000)	(7,394,000)	(7,292,000)	(+260,000)	(−401,000)	(−102,000)
Accountwide adjustment			(−581,000)	(−411,000)	(−411,000)	(−411,000)	(+170,000)
Subtotal, research and special programs	(26,238,000)	(31,662,000)	(26,030,000)	(24,281,000)	(−1,957,000)	(−7,381,000)	(−1,749,000)
Pipeline safety (Pipeline Safety Fund)	34,991,500	39,720,000	27,243,000	30,275,000	−4,716,500	−9,445,000	+3,032,000
Pipeline safety (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund)	2,432,500	2,698,000	2,698,000	2,698,000	+265,500		
Subtotal, Pipeline safety	37,424,000	42,418,000	29,941,000	32,973,000	−4,451,000	−9,445,000	+3,032,000
Alaska Pipeline task Force (Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund) (rescission)	(−544,000)				(+544,000)		
Emergency preparedness grants:							
(Emergency preparedness fund)	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000			
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,800,000)	(11,338,000)	(8,890,000)	(9,200,000)	(−1,600,000)	(−2,138,000)	(+310,000)
Total, Research and Special Programs Admin	64,062,000	74,480,000	56,371,000	57,654,000	−6,408,000	−16,826,000	+1,283,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(10,800,000)	(11,338,000)	(8,890,000)	(9,200,000)	(−1,600,000)	(−2,138,000)	(+310,000)

Total budgetary resources	(74,862,000)	(85,818,000)	(65,261,000)	(66,854,000)	(−8,008,000)	(−18,964,000)	(+1,593,000)
Office of Inspector General							
Salaries and expenses	40,000,000	40,238,000	40,238,000	39,891,200	−108,800	−346,800	−346,800
Bureau of Transportation Statistics							
Salaries and expenses				2,200,000	+2,200,000	+2,200,000	+2,200,000
General Provisions							
Administrative provision: Procurement (sec. 323a)	−65,120,000				+65,120,000		
Bureau of Transportation Statistics (transfer from Federal-aid Highways)	(15,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+5,000,000)		
Federal railroad transfer (sec. 341)	3,000,000				−3,000,000		
Federal-aid highways (sec. 310 (e))		−574,341,000				+574,341,000	
Working capital fund reduction (sec. 327)	−7,000,000		−10,000,000	−5,000,000	+2,000,000	−5,000,000	+5,000,000
DOT field office consolidation (sec. 335)			−25,000,000	−25,000,000	−25,000,000	−25,000,000	
ICC transition (sec. 344)			8,421,000				−8,421,000
Total, title I, Dept of Transportation (net)	14,134,164,000	14,203,727,029	12,754,756,004	12,559,071,765	−1,575,092,235	−1,644,655,264	−195,684,239
Appropriations	(14,252,275,000)	(14,249,114,000)	(12,849,690,160)	(12,902,720,200)	(−1,349,554,800)	(−1,346,393,800)	(+53,030,040)
Rescissions	(−118,111,000)	(−45,386,971)	(−94,934,156)	(−343,648,435)	(−225,537,435)	(−298,261,464)	(−248,714,279)
(Limitations on obligations)	(21,770,423,000)	(24,907,387,000)	(22,646,440,000)	(21,319,888,536)	(−450,534,464)	(−3,587,498,464)	(−1,326,551,464)
(Exempt obligations)	(2,267,701,000)	(80,000,000)	(2,311,932,000)	(2,331,507,000)	(+63,806,000)	(+2,251,507,000)	(+19,575,000)
Total budgetary resources including (limitations on obligations) and (exempt obligations)	(38,172,288,000)	(39,191,114,029)	(37,713,128,004)	(36,210,467,301)	(−1,961,820,699)	(−2,980,646,728)	(−1,502,660,703)
Adjustments made for unified program		−3,199,373,000				+3,199,373,000	
(Limitation on obligations)		(−24,420,105,000)				(+24,420,105,000)	
Unified transportation infrastructure invest program		24,392,976,000				−24,392,976,000	
Total budgetary resources	(38,172,288,000)	(39,163,985,029)	(37,713,128,004)	(36,210,467,301)	(−1,961,820,699)	(−2,953,517,728)	(−1,502,660,703)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES							
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board							
Salaries and expenses	3,350,000	3,656,000	3,656,000	3,500,000	+150,000	−156,000	−156,000
National Transportation Safety Board							
Salaries and expenses	37,392,000	38,774,000	38,774,000	37,500,000	+108,000	−1,274,000	−1,274,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—Continued

Item	1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Emergency fund	.....	360,802	160,802	360,802	+360,802	.....	+200,000
Total, National Transportation Safety Board	37,392,000	39,134,802	38,934,802	37,860,802	+468,802	−1,274,000	−1,074,000
Interstate Commerce Commission							
Salaries and expenses	30,302,000	28,844,000	13,379,000	13,379,000	−16,923,000	−15,465,000	.....
Payments for directed rail service (limitation on obligations)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	.....	.....	.....
Total, Interstate Commerce Commission	(30,777,000)	(29,319,000)	(13,854,000)	(13,854,000)	(−16,923,000)	(−15,465,000)	.....
Panama Canal Commission							
Panama Canal Revolving Fund:							
(Administrative expenses)	(50,030,000)	(50,741,000)	(50,741,000)	(50,741,000)	(+711,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on operating and capital expenses)	(540,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	(−540,000,000)	.....	.....
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority							
Interest payments and repayments of principal	9,193,000	.....	.....	.....	−9,193,000	.....	.....
Total, title II, Related Agencies	80,237,000	71,634,802	55,969,802	54,739,802	−25,497,198	−16,895,000	−1,230,000
(Limitation on obligations)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	(475,000)	.....	.....	.....
Total budgetary resources	(80,712,000)	(72,109,802)	(56,444,802)	(55,214,802)	(−25,497,198)	(−16,895,000)	(−1,230,000)
Total appropriations (net)	14,214,401,000	35,468,964,831	12,810,725,806	12,613,811,567	−1,600,589,433	−22,855,153,264	−196,914,239

○